

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1879.

ART. I.—THE SELF-INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

—
BY THE EDITOR.
—

By the self-interpretation of Scripture we mean in general that it carries in itself the light which illumines its pages for him who studies it in the right spirit, and that it authenticates itself to his mind and heart as the Word of God. The revelation in the written Word corresponds to the revelation in the incarnate Word. They are not just identical, yet in a very deep sense they are one. This oneness appears from the fact that there are passages of Scripture in which the Word is referred to, where it may mean either the written or the incarnate Word, and commentators are unable to decide either for the one or the other exclusively. For instance, "Sanctify them by thy truth, ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου; thy Word is truth." The truth here refers not merely to words addressed to the intellect, but it includes a divine vitalizing power in the Spirit by, or in, which the whole man is sanctified, made holy.

As the incarnate Word therefore carried its own illumination and authentication in Himself for the faith of men, the same may be said of the written Word. Jesus of Nazareth proved Himself to be the Son of God, not by any argument from beyond Himself, but, primarily by the light that shone forth from His own person. "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father." He illumined even His own

miracles. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and *manifested forth His glory.*" In the same way the written Word authenticates itself to faith as the Word of God, and is to be interpreted and apprehended in its own light.

This, briefly stated, is our theme.

The proposition we have enunciated implies that there can be no canon of interpretation which stands over and above the Word in authority. Such have been claimed, and it may be well to notice these claims first, although their full rebuttal will appear only when we have considered our theme positively.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CANON.

This canon teaches that the infallible interpretation of the Scripture is by divine appointment entrusted to the Church. By the Church, moreover, is meant the Roman Hierarchy culminating in the Pope. He is the head of the teaching Church, the *ecclesia docens*, and he is illumined and empowered to interpret infallibly the divine Word. This canon of interpretation elevates the Church above the Word of God and gives it an authority above the Scriptures. The Roman Catholics do not hesitate to claim this prerogative for their Church. It is urged that the Church existed before the written Word, and therefore its authority must be above that of the Scriptures. But to this it may be replied that the Old Testament Word was present when the Christian Church was founded, and the spoken Words of our Lord were the living power in the Church before they were written. The Church really was founded on Christ, and His Words as the Words of God were spirit and life.

To make the Church an infallible authority for interpreting the Scriptures in the Roman Catholic sense, that is, in the sense that the meaning of Scripture cannot reach the private Christian directly, but must be authoritatively and infallibly conveyed through another medium, is to exalt that medium above the Word itself. In such case the Church is made the organ of direct divine utterance, in place of God's Word.

In controverting this theory it is not meant to set aside the

authoritative preaching of the Word. The preaching of the Word is by divine appointment. Nor is it intended to deny the proposition that the Bible is given primarily to be received and interpreted by believers, entrusted to the Church, and through the Church to be proclaimed to the world. But as he who preaches Christ is not exalted above the incarnate Word, so the preaching of the Gospel must not be exalted above the Word itself.

THE THEORY OF RATIONALISM.

A second theory that has had, and still has, many adherents, is, that the natural reason is the infallible umpire to interpret the meaning of the Scriptures. The revelation contained in the Bible, it is said, is addressed to man's reason. God is the author of reason as well as revelation. Therefore the meaning of Scripture must be subject to reason. Locke, I think it was, said that reason is the eye and Scripture is the telescope for looking at the supernatural realities of revelation. This theory is itself subject to different meanings. It may mean that reason in general, cultivated and enlightened reason, reason as embodied in science and philosophy, is to determine first the authority of Scripture, and then to interpret its meaning. Or it may mean that each man's private judgment is to be the umpire in interpreting Scripture. In either case it is open to the objection that it exalts reason above revelation.

The Reformers never advocated this theory. It is true, the Roman Catholic Church charged them with it; but whoever examines their teaching will find that it was very different from the notion of private judgment in this sense. They emphasized the inability of natural reason to apprehend the mysteries of revelation. They held up the insufficiency of human philosophy. They taught that only the mind illumined by the Holy Spirit can discern the truth of supernatural revelation. Hence it is charged sometimes that they taught a private inspiration by the Holy Spirit, and thus fell into fanaticism. Whether there is truth in this charge or not, it implies that they did not teach rationalism. They could not hold at the same time that natural

reason is the umpire in interpreting Scripture and also that the Holy Spirit interprets its meaning for the believer.

We may recognize an element of truth also in rationalism. The natural and the supernatural are revelations from one and the same God. We need not, in denying the error of rationalism, make a contradiction or a dualism between reason and revelation, as the Romanist does, and as also did the supernaturalists of the 17th century. Revelation does authenticate itself to reason. The Bible cannot and does not contradict reason. It simply transcends reason. It comes bearing a higher light from the supernatural world, which shines into the lower, natural order, and thus illumines reason itself. Man is not required to abnegate his reason as Jesuitism teaches, and receive the truths of revelation as a mere external *aepositum*, on the grounds of an authority which stands over him in a like external way. Reason has its legitimate function in interpreting the Bible, and in contending for its legitimate rights it has had justice on its side. Faith is the highest reason.

But the point here is whether the Bible or reason stands higher in authority, whether reason can furnish the light by which revelation is to be interpreted and understood, or revelation carries that higher light in itself, and performs the double function of making known supernatural truth and also conveys the power of apprehending it. "In Thy light shall we see light." We shall have occasion to notice this point more fully further on. Our object here is merely to state rather than discuss the theory of rationalism.

PRIVATE INSPIRATION.

A third theory of interpretation, which appears very plausible and finds many adherents, is, that the Holy Spirit is the interpreter of Scripture. This theory, which might be designated also the "Inner Light theory," has different meanings. Some in all ages, as the Quakers in later times, find the supreme authority for interpreting revelation in an inner light that is given to men. With some this inner light is made to be the

substance of revelation itself, and which in the end supersedes the necessity of an external Word and sacraments. Others hold it, more after the orthodox teaching of the Church, as consisting in the illumining power of the Holy Spirit dwelling in them. This then again differs. With the fanatical Anabaptists of the 16th century it claimed superiority over the external word also. With Luther it stood rather as what is designated the material principle of Protestantism over against, or in union with, the formal principle. He emphasized it so far as to make it an umpire for interpreting the Bible, yea, even determining by it for himself which books may be received as inspired and which rejected. He himself who so harshly and even rudely rebuked the Anabaptists, was not entirely free from the fanaticism he condemned in them.

The theory of private illumination by the Holy Spirit is at fault in that it overlooks the general inspiration of the Church. St. Peter says, "no prophecy is of any private interpretation," whatever that means. If individuals are illumined by the Holy Spirit, which we of course believe, it is no less true that the general mind of the Church is illumined by the same Spirit, and therefore one person should not arbitrarily set his illumination against the mind of the believing Church at large. But neither may we regard this so-called general illumination by the Spirit as an umpire, in the sense of setting it above the external Word; for in that case we make a dualism between the Spirit and the Word, and come back again to the Roman theory of ecclesiastical infallibility. The Spirit does not teach independently of the Word. "The Spirit of Truth," our Lord says, "shall not speak of Himself: but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak."

There is unquestionably a large amount of error afloat in the current doctrine of the Holy Spirit in reference to this point. In the line of the tendency to tri-theism, in the apprehension of the dogma of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit is conceived of as separate from Christ and His Word. Where this erroneous tendency prevails there is an undervaluing first of the real

presence of Christ. The Spirit is substituted for Him, notwithstanding He repeatedly declares in connection with the promise of the Paraclete, "I will come to you;" and in the second place there is a separation between the written Word and the Spirit. Our Lord calls the Paraclete the Spirit of Truth, and He declares also that He Himself is the Truth. The external Word, which enshrines the internal, vivifying Word, which is the fructifying seed of the Sower who went forth to sow, is so one with the Spirit, that they cannot be regarded as separate, or performing separate functions, just as the Spirit cannot be separated from the incarnate Word. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of our Lord.

EXTERNAL AUTHORITY.

If then the Bible is not to be authoritatively and infallibly interpreted by the Church, by reason, nor by private inspiration or any sort of inspiration as over and above the self-illuminating power of the Word itself, may we look for any new prophet or messenger who is divinely sent to open to us the true inner sense of the Word of God? This claim, we know, was made by Emmanuel Swedenborg, and it has been made by writings such as the Koran and the book of Mormon, as at least a supplement to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

We do not refer here to the claims of Swedenborg's interpretation of the Bible when judged on its own merits. So far as it claims to be supported and authenticated or confirmed by the Bible itself, that interpretation must be judged just as any other interpretation of human commentators. It cannot be justly condemned merely because it has been given by Swedenborg. And we believe his followers generally claim, at least when pressed on this point, that they do not accept his interpretation of the internal sense of the Word of God in holy Scripture, merely on the authority of Swedenborg, but on the authority of that Word itself. Swedenborg declared himself, they urge, that his interpretation must first be tried, and accepted only as it is confirmed by the Bible itself. In that view

nothing certainly can be said against its right to be considered and weighed according to its merits. If it proves itself to be confirmed by the Bible itself it must be accepted. But just here lies the difficulty. In thus trying and testing it, must we not make use of those rules of interpretation which are to be applied in all right interpretation of the Word of God?

No one indeed can assert in truth that he may not have been chosen as an instrument to give a deeper interpretation of the Bible, just as the Reformers were raised up for this purpose in their day. But, here, it seems to us, his authority must end. No one regards Zwingli, Luther, or Calvin, as infallible in their interpretation of the Word of God. Their teaching must verify itself by the Bible, so that here again we get no authority above the Bible. Swedenborg claims that the internal sense was specially revealed to him, and that the Church could never have come to know it without this revelation. Moreover he professes to have had much revealed to him that is not contained in the Bible. This must come under the test of the Bible itself. We are not here urging anything for or against the teaching of Swedenborg. We believe it reveals weakness and fanaticism quite as much to condemn his teaching merely because he is the author of it, as it does to accept it blindly on the ground of a supernatural authority delegated to him. But what we claim here is that no man or messenger can come as authority over the self-illuminating and self-authenticating power of the Word itself, not even an angel from heaven. But, according to Protestant doctrine God may teach through Swedenborg just as well as through the fathers, mediæval doctors, or Reformers. Always, however, the Scriptures are to be the supreme authority and only rule of faith and practice. This is sound Protestant doctrine, and it means far more than even the Reformers knew.

In going on now to consider positively what is to be understood by the self-interpretation of Scripture, we may be aided by turning our attention again to the manner in which the incarnate Word authenticated Himself to faith as the Son of

God. We have already said that there is more than a deep analogy here. The close relation between the incarnate Word and the written Word, their one-ness, we may say, leads us to conclude that the one must be the key to the other. It was the Word of God in the Old Testament that contained in it the mystery of the Christ, and the Lord opened the meaning of the Old Testament. The greater light, of course, is the incarnate Word, and the written Word could not be understood except through Him. Yet they are not two, but one, at least in a very deep sense.

How, then, did our Lord authenticate to men the mystery of His person? In other words, how did men come to know that He was divine? We reply, mainly by the light that shone forth from the divine enshrined in His human nature. If we consider the case properly it is plain that there could be no other way. No one in the universe but He could know the overwhelming mystery by direct, personal knowledge. "No one hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son (God, in the Syriac Peshito version), in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." It was no doubt an overwhelming mystery first for His own apprehension. When the time came for Him to reveal it to His disciples, He approached them and called them as one having authority, and then began to attract their susceptible spirits to Himself by those wonderful processes which gradually awakened in their hearts faith, that is an apprehension of the divine that dwelt in Him. He spake to them the divine Word of the Old Testament Scripture with new power; He performed wonderful works; He exhibited to them the perfection of holiness; to some of them He unveiled His glory in the sacred mount; by degrees He spake to them of the Father, and declared that He and the Father are one. We never read of His employing the so-called evidences of Christianity, in the way of intellectual argumentation, to convince their minds first as the basis of faith. It was rather the other way. Faith had to precede knowledge, the spiritual apprehension had to go before the intellectual. When He said to Peter,

"Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father which is in heaven," He excludes the thought that his faith was the result of any creaturely resources, and also, when properly understood, anything like a divine testimony from God as outside of, or beyond, His own person; for He afterwards declared, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

The revelation, moreover, had to be to each of the disciples according to his preparedness to receive it, or rather we may say, each of the disciples had to come to this apprehension of the mystery for himself. One could not take it merely from the declaration of another. Doubting Thomas had to come to it for himself. No matter what the evidences (so-called) might be, they could only reveal as they themselves were first illumined by the light from His own person.

The full metaphysical explanation of this may be difficult, and if we seem to labor in stating it, the reason lies partly in the point itself, and partly in the fact that the thinking of the age has become so fixed in a contrary theory. Especially since the time of Bacon, and with blinding power since the obscuration of still later scientific rationalism, as set forth in such writings as those of Herbert Spencer and the Evolution theorizers, the notion has become fixed as a sort of aphorism, that man reaches the higher truth through the light of a lower, thus rising "from nature up to nature's God," if indeed there be a God. In the face of this current of thinking it is difficult to appear as speaking good common sense to assert the contrary. Must we not go from lower degrees of knowledge to higher, step by step, learning first our letters, then words, and lastly sentences? Must we not study the internal and spiritual from the external and natural, the inner sense of the Bible from the external by a process of reasoning from the lower to the higher? And does not the light that guides us in this process always come from the lower forms of knowledge to illumine the higher? So the thinking runs, and it seems plausible, and it has been reiterated so long that it has become a sort of self-evident truth or theory. And what makes it dif-

difficult to refute is the fact that it contains a measure of truth. The spiritual in a certain sense does come up out of the natural, the house does rise from its foundation.

Yet for all this we nevertheless assert that the real process is directly the other way. Language is before its elements in letters and words, the spiritual man is before the natural or physical, the house is before the foundation, the spiritual meaning in the Word of God is before the natural, the internal before the external, and the light of the divine in our Lord shines before the human. If we speak in paradoxes, we nevertheless speak what is true. The light that comes from the lower is always a reflection of light from the higher, and there is a sense—a deep sense—in which our apprehension of things must always follow this order likewise. If we never had seen or known of a sun, we could not learn it by a process of reasoning from the *reflection* of the sun's light that reaches us from the moon. Man could not rise from nature up to nature's God, if the light of God did not first arise in the human spirit, and at the same time shine *through* nature. But we will not continue this statement and explanation. The reader must follow it out in his own thinking.

We will be more clearly understood by saying that the divine goodness, purity, and truth in our Lord had to be apprehended by a spiritual insight rather than it had to come as the result of intellectual reasoning. We are here on plainer ground. If the divinity of Christ could have been demonstrated to the reason, as a mathematical problem, then all rational minds could have been convinced. The same difficulty confronts us at this day. It can be shown to the general enlightened mind that Cæsar was a great general, and Shakspeare a great genius, but that our Lord is God, who can reveal that but God Himself in and through the divine-human person of Christ, the Lord. Conviction, or assent, cannot come as the result of an external declaration. Hence our Saviour never resorted to this as a basis for belief in His person. Who art Thou? was often asked, but He did not reply, "I am God in

human form." His reply recorded in John viii. 25, "Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning," seems to leave the matter in the dark, and is most probably not a correct rendering. His whole life and work told them who He was, and if they could not apprehend this Word, no mere declaration would be able to communicate the mystery to them.

This fact when meditated upon serves to refute the Roman Catholic view of faith, that it is merely assent to truth addressed to the intellect on certain authority. We know their argument: a child may be certain in giving its assent to a declaration from its mother on the ground that it is assured of the mother's veracity, without having any inward assurance, or even understanding, of the declaration in itself. So by a certain process of reasoning open to the natural mind it can be shown that the Church is divinely appointed to teach, after which it is only necessary to give assent to its teachings in order to have full assurance. But when the Church asserts its infallibility, and asks men to assent to its declaration that *Christ is God*, it is clear that the Church must be able first to authenticate itself as infallible before its testimony can be taken with absolute assurance; and this authentication presents the same problem that is presented in our Lord's revealing His own divinity, because it involves a claim to supernatural endowments. Besides, the truth thus received on such authority would have to authenticate itself afterwards in its own light and meaning in order to be a living truth for the spirit. Just as when the Samaritans received the testimony of the woman from the well, and came and saw and heard Christ, they said to the woman: "Henceforth we believe in Him, not on account of thy word; for we have heard Him ourselves, and we know that He truly is the Messiah, the Saviour of the world." The Church is commissioned to testify that Jesus Christ is God, but the highest authentication must come, not from the Church, but from our Lord Himself to the minds and hearts of men. The Roman Church puts the case the other way: I believe the

Church is infallible in its teaching, therefore I am certainly, absolutely assured that Jesus is the Son of God.

Nor is the case any better when it is undertaken to prove that Christ is divine by mere natural reason. We mean not for a moment to ignore or undervalue such arguments. The argument from our Saviour's miracles, or His teaching, or His perfect human life, all these are legitimate, and have their force on the basis of reason; but true faith must come at last from a direct apprehension of the light of His divinity, and this light in the end must verify the arguments drawn from a lower source.

In the 17th century Protestants constructed their argument from the Bible much in the same way that Romanists constructed theirs from the Church. Arguments addressed to the natural reason can prove that the Bible is inspired, and therefore what it asserts must be assented to as truth. The Bible asserts that Christ is God, therefore He is God, and to believe this is to have faith in Christ. But this does not carry us beyond the Roman view of faith; for the Bible here is made to be a testimony apart from Christ, and this testimony is made to rest on human ratiocination, therefore the divinity of Christ comes in the end to rest on natural reason. Such testimony has its place and value, as said above. The child of Christian parents receives it in this way. But such assent must afterwards be inspired by a higher, a direct personal assurance, otherwise it remains external and inefficient—remains so, we mean, if the Word is regarded as mere external testimony. The words of the Bible, we know, are more than that, but we are referring to them now merely as a testimony apart from their living power as joined to the Lord.

The conclusion we reach, if we have not too much beclouded it is, that the Godhead in Christ must authenticate itself to the faith of men by its own inherent light and power, and it must do this to the spiritual apprehension of each individual in his own experience. Then the prophecy is fulfilled that men shall no longer say to each other, know thou the Lord (as by exter-

nal teaching and testimony), but all shall know Him from the least even to the greatest.

Now the written Word must in the same way interpret itself in its internal, spiritual meaning as divine—as the Word of the Lord, and it must do so to every person for himself. It carries in itself this power to all who come to it with the proper preparation and especially with the right spirit. There are certainly conditions necessary. It must reach and address him. Certain things are necessary for this purpose. He must know the language of the Scriptures, they must be translated for those who cannot read the original; he must have a right spirit, must make proper account of the general mind of the Church in the bosom of which he stands, etc. But when this Word reaches his ear, reaches his external ear in its external, human form, it carries in itself an illumining and life-giving power for his spiritual life which comes from the Lord whose Word it is. That light and life hold in its internal spiritual sense, which is in the external in some sort as the germ is in the external seed. Thus it is indeed, as our Lord says, like seed which a sower went forth to sow, and falling into good ground it springs up and brings forth fruit, some forty, some sixty, some an hundred-fold.

What this internal spiritual sense is we may endeavor to explain. The general truth, that under the figure or dress of natural things spiritual truths are contained in the Scriptures is assented to by all who believe it to be the Word of God. That its history, geography, terms, etc., have some reference to spiritual things, all will allow. The account of the creation in Genesis, the flood, the call of Abraham, the whole Jewish economy, with its sacrifice, priest and temple, its land of Canaan, its mountains and streams, and in the New Testament, birth and bread, the parables, etc., etc., that all these are designed to teach man truths in regard to a higher spiritual world, and that therefore in some way a spiritual meaning must be sought for, in a general way at least, beneath all this natural exterior, this is assented to by all. But by the spiritual

is very largely meant only a sort of spiritualization of the natural for the mind, and this then is to be used as a means in a more or less natural way again to produce certain influences on the mind and heart. In this way the realm of spiritual existence, the new creation brought in by the Lord Jesus Christ, is changed into a kind of spiritualized naturalism, and the realities of that world become intellectual notions, imaginations, or thoughts merely, instead of the most real things.

If it is the object of the Bible to reveal to man the spiritual world, then the natural and human in the Scriptures everywhere must have its ultimate meaning in the things of that world. To explain our meaning here we may take one of the most difficult portions of the Bible, one around which the contests of science with revelation are continually exhibiting themselves. The account of the creation in Genesis,—is the object there to make known to man the natural origin of the universe? So it is very often supposed, and accordingly commentators and scientists often vie with each other in giving it an interpretation which will make it harmonize with the teachings of science—with Astronomy and Geology. But that this is not the object of that narrative we may learn from the reference in *Hebrews*, where it is said, "By faith we know that the worlds were made by the Word of God, so that the things seen were not made of the things that do appear," or, "were made of the things that do not appear." Here we are at once carried beyond what is regarded as the natural origin of the universe (which scientists are forever seeking) to a supernatural origin, and from an apprehension by reason to an apprehension by faith. That origin is the Word of God, and that which upholds the order of nature is a spiritual realm. But this is not all. If the external sense in Genesis refers to things in the order of nature, the internal sense clearly must refer to that spiritual creation which underlies the natural, to "the things that do not appear," and these are the realities with which the revelation there has to do. Hence while men are disputing about the external forms of the truth there revealed, they are

overlooking the spiritual things which those external forms enshrine. There is no question here for science, but rather the first great truth that all things exist in and through the divine Word, and that the visible and external enshrines spiritual things.

The Bible, I think it may be asserted, never communicates natural facts or events as having their end in themselves, in the way that science or history does. Its object is not to teach history or science. The natural facts or events, the natural things referred to, always stand connected with spiritual things which it is the object of the Scriptures to reveal. The incoming of the kingdom of God is figured or adumbrated through every part. Hence to appeal to the Scriptures in order to decide questions of history, chronology, geography, or science in any form is useless and vain. It uses natural things as a language through which to reveal supernatural things. Hence it makes its own laws, and its interpretation must be conformed to these laws. An analogy of this may be found in the language of genius. We do not go to a historical drama of Shakspeare to learn the facts of history. His chronology may not be correct in this sense. There are anachronisms in his dramas. But he uses men and things to body forth the creations of art, the things in the world of the beautiful. Hence the natural sense or interpretation must be subordinated to the artistic sense. Art has its own laws of interpretation which must be interpreted by the artistic sense in man. In a higher sense supernatural revelation has its own laws of interpretation. Hence its spiritual meaning can never be determined by the natural sense merely through the natural laws of interpreting human language. The one, it is true, is contained in the other. The spiritual reaches us through the natural, but the spiritual determines for us the meaning of the natural. The natural sense of a parable of our Lord, for instance, could never determine for natural reason, even though it were the mind of a Plato, the spiritual things which are contained in the parable. Yet the spiritual things in the parable are so contained in the

natural that in hearts susceptible of spiritual apprehension the spiritual or internal sense opens itself by its own inward illumination.

It may be said, then, that a revelation is required here in order to understand the revelation. The key to the spiritual sense, must be given first from some other source beyond the Scripture in order to understand the Scripture. We answer, no; the relation of the spiritual sense to the natural sense, although according to a law of its own is such, nevertheless, that the one is the vehicle for conveying the other. The spiritual sense shines through the natural by its own light. Our analogy shows this. In a work of art, it might be said, you must first apprehend the ideal of the artist before you can understand the form. Yet the ideal is so joined to the form that it must be apprehended only in and through the form, and not in the way of abstract idea or thought. Standing before a work of art the ideal of the artist shines through the form and becomes joined to the apprehension of the beholder, and he exclaims, I see it and rejoice in it.

If there is such an ideal realm of art which verifies itself to the phantasy through natural external forms according to its own unique laws of the relation between the idea and the form, can we doubt that the spiritual world authenticates itself to man's spiritual apprehension in its own way and by its own light?

This may appear to be a paradox. The spiritual is revealed through and by means of the natural, and yet the spiritual must determine the meaning of the natural. But so it is. Natural birth is employed by our Lord to reveal the meaning of spiritual regeneration, yet the new birth from above is necessary in order to see this meaning. The revelation of the kingdom of God is necessary in order to the new birth, and yet "except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." The apparent paradox is not of our making,—it is set forth in the Bible itself.

It might seem then that there are no objective rational rules

for interpreting the Bible, and hence no use for creeds and doctrines in the Church. But it is not so. These creeds and doctrines are right and necessary for their own ends and purposes. In the Word of God the revelation of spiritual truth is communicated to man; while creed is a response which the believing Church makes as to the things believed. Doctrines are the intellectual statement of the truths of revelation. Both are necessary for the community of the Church. In our Reformed Church their office has been frequently and fully set forth. But the Word of God is the direct medium of revelation from the Lord. Hence the Bible stands above all creeds and dogmas. While there is a community in the expression of creed and in the apprehension of doctrine, yet the divine Word must communicate to each one according to his spiritual susceptibility. All may join in repeating the same creed, but the Word of God must come to each person in his own measure and degree. The endless diversity in the measure of apprehending the divine Word does not in any way interfere with the unity of the Church. But this unity is primarily and essentially internal and spiritual, and is based upon a community of life from our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence while the Word of God dwells in the communion of saints as one common body or organism, it comes directly to each member of the communion as his spiritual food.

We would not set aside or undervalue the various appliances that have been brought into requisition for the study of the Bible. They are all proper conditions in their place. It is only when they are set up as carrying in themselves the power to determine the sense of the Word of God that they usurp the place of the self-illuminating power of the Scriptures. With all our Biblical criticism and Biblical research, we must not put this in the place of that light and power which come to all sincere readers of the Word of God with or without this human knowledge. Even the most learned commentators must feel when they read the inspired page that there is a light and a life there for their religious experience which is infinitely more

than all human learning. Hence with the teaching of Protestantism we hold that the Bible is for each and all, the learned and the unlearned, and that no privileged class should usurp the prerogative of holding in their keeping exclusively its sense and meaning, to be doled out at second-hand for the benefit of the multitude. They shall all be taught of the Lord through His holy Word.

ARTICLE II.—THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMAN.

BY REV. W. A. HALE.

I APPROACH the discussion of this subject with considerable diffidence, yet I must assert, that the emancipation of woman exists only in words. What I mean by this term, is the *full, free and unrestrained* exercise of their intellectual and moral faculties.

While there are some advanced and cultivated minds, that recognize in the present economy of society a tendency to a more healthful culture, and therefore a more enlarged sphere of action—a greater variety of employment, and a superior kind of enjoyment of life for the sex, a very large proportion of those engaged in public culture are distressed, lest woman should, in her advancement, offend the modesty of nature, although they appear to be sublimely ignorant of any well defined notion of what constitutes nature's order.

The *Popular Science Monthly*, the June and July numbers, each contain an article from the pen of a very acute thinker upon "Woman from a Zoological point of view." This writer says, "Woman is the complement of man." He looks to her improvement as one of the "important paths to be pursued by the race." He makes this statement in the June number and in the July number. He says that she occupies

the positions that she should, and finds through his long course of reasoning, that there is no improvement necessary. A toilsome journey he has taken to find that he need not have taken it.

He asserts the existence of a fundamental difference between the mental and moral organisms of the sexes, and that this is based upon the physical difference. He would solve all the problems of the moral and mental realm upon a physiological basis, and in the light of physical science, seek an outlet from the complexities of her domestic, social and civil relations to society.

He makes a very modest statement upon which [in the very next sentence] he builds a superstructure of most colossal proportions: [1st page, June number *Popular Science Monthly*].

"While we fully recognize the insignificance of the merely animal difference between the sexes, as compared with the intellectual and moral influence, it is none the less true, that the origin of the latter is to be found in the former in the same manner—to use a humble illustration—the origin of the self-denying, disinterested devotion of a dog to his master is to be found in that self-abnegation which is necessary in order that a herd of wolves may act in concert under a leader for the general good."

Now, it is plain that he recognizes from his position a superiority of the male sex, and that he proves it by an application of the above abstruse statement. We will therefore untangle his words and then look at them.

1st. The animal difference between the sexes is insignificant.

2d. The intellectual and moral difference is significant. There must always be an adequate cause for every effect; the cause of equal importance with the effect in science.

3d. Therefore, this insignificant animal difference is adequate to produce a *most* significant, mental and moral difference. And the explanation of this difference is to be found in the self-imposed self-denial and devotion of the dog. That is to be explained by interpreting the self-abnegation which is ne-

cessary that a herd of wolves may act under a leader for the general good. If we can discover how a herd of wolves are led to acknowledge a leader, he says, we will then prove the relation between the dog and his master explained.

We will now try to explain the relation between the wolves.

1st. Twenty (20) wolves, male and female, act under one leader for the obtaining of food and for defense. We will now suppose that this leadership is established by what the usual causes are that produce great courage in this otherwise not courageous animal. When hungry, he acts to obtain food. When attacked, for defense. Some one more courageous (for the cause above assigned) by his or her forwardness in attack, will stimulate the others to act. Just as she is foremost to act through an artificial courage, so she is ready to act at all times in the line of her instincts. *a.* To get food. *b.* To defend her young. *c.* To resist any encroachments upon her instincts by other wolves. And therefore by superiority of selfishness causes other wolves to respect her as a dangerous enemy and a successful leader. On account of superiority of muscle and disagreeable disposition she gains this ascendancy, where the animal difference is zero. And this is the way the male sex first established their superiority.

* * * * *

The relation of the dog to his master is entirely different. He is endowed by nature for the forming of friendly attachments, and his master cultivates this quality of nature by leading the dog to feel his dependence upon him—he supplies his wants—he punishes his disobedience—he brings the dog to recognize the marked animal difference—and the dog becomes his devoted servant. Not, however, without having first experienced that his dog nature has been lassoed.

He calls this a “humble illustration.” This I grant him, for it utterly fails him in this his time of need.

The above illustration was employed to show that the subordinate position is in the natural order of things, and is explained by a physical difference in organization removed less than a de-

gree from zero, and implies such a multiplication of forces as the ultimate effect is removed from the original cause, that we cannot fail to despair of a solution in that direction, and will therefore dismiss this hypothesis as of no value.

While there is that in the organism of woman that enables her to perform the natural office of the sex, it is not in itself degrading. It does not imply a mental and moral difference in favor of man.

This very acute thinker proceeds with a history of the development of the female sex, from the lowest forms of animal life upwards, until he reaches the human race. Holding that the office of the female is a conservative one, while that of the male is progressive. That the conservative element in female character is opposed to progress, and, therefore, evidence of inferiority. [June number, page 154].

"If this is so, and if the female organism is the conservative organism to which is intrusted the keeping of all that has been gained during the past history of the race, it must follow that the female mind is a store-house filled with the instincts, habits, intuitions, laws of conduct, which have been gained by past experience. The male organism, on the contrary, being the variable organism, the originating element in the process of evolution, the male mind must have the power of extending experience over new fields, and by comparison and generalization, of discovering new laws of nature, which are in their turn to become rules of action, and to be added to the series of past experience.

Now this will read when unraveled :

1st. The female mind is a conservative mind, keeping as in a store-house, all past experience of the race. A conservative mind is one that is not variable. A variable mind is progressive.

2d. The male mind is progressive, because it is variable.

Therefore the female mind is inferior to the male mind, because it is conservative.

Now this is not a true statement of the case, because the

conservative element exists in the male mind as well as the female mind, by which it holds tenaciously to all past experience, and by comparison of the past experience with any new element in experience, decides upon a course of conduct. He indicates that the conservative element restrains the exercise of mental experiment, which is most palpably erroneous. [See Hamilton's *Metaphysics*, page 409].

"Without a power of acquisition, a power of conservation could not be exerted, and without the latter the former would be prostrated, for we should lose as fast as we acquired."

The conservative power does not imply the absence of the acquiring power, by reproduction, representation, generalization, and comparison, and extending powers of mind over new fields of study. It is a historical fact, that very much of what has been added to the experience and knowledge of the race, has been the result of experiment, governed by the directing hand of conservation.

Especially is this true in mechanical discovery. That what we should regard as the result of reasoning, has been almost accidental, that much of this has resulted from the labor of the male mind only, argues the fact that the male mind has been acting under conditions favorable for such accidents to occur, and has shown a praiseworthy readiness at appropriation. Now that the male mind has earned a reputation of superior character, is due not to his sex but to his vocation. [See *Popular Science Monthly*, June, '79, page 155].

"This important and fundamental difference between the male intellect and the female must have a very great influence in determining the occupations or professions in which each sex is most likely to succeed when brought into fair competition with the other sex."

This is a naked assertion. The proper sentence would have read, that the fundamental similarity of mind being an absolute identity, in which we can discover no law determining the pursuit best adapted to each sex, we must seek the reason not in the mental and moral, but in God's well defined personal difference.

He urges that the male mind shows superiority in that it can reason abstractly, while the female mind has shown no radical tendency in this direction. "Though the capacity for work of this kind is very exceptional among men." With this argument, I assert he has not proved it; he assumes an existence, that may be real to his imagination but does not appear in his paper: besides, women have shown adaptation for this kind of work. And the great philosophers of Greece sat at their feet. There is also ample example of abstract thought, in the works of George Elliot, George Sands, and the Story of Avis is a marvel on account of the keen, strong current of philosophy running through it. [See *July Popular Science Monthly*, page 348].

Here is a plea for the superiority of the male mind, on the ground that the female mind is keenly intuitive. But I believe among metaphysicians of to day, it is generally held, that the power of mind called intuition is not free from the process of reasoning, but with delicate sensibility touches the points of cause in every case *with* deference in arriving at a conclusion. "Superiority of women in predicting conduct will be shown by their possession to a much greater degree than men of the power to persuade or influence, as distinguished from the power to convince more by arguments; for to convince is to innovate, place matters in a new light, but the secret influence is a vivid appreciation of the established motives and incentives to conduct."

Now the power to persuade is not evidence of inferiority, but superior force by which great men try to move the world. It implies the insinuation of the feeling, sympathies and desires of the advocate upon the addressed [Judge or Jury], and was cultivated by Demosthenes, and many of the most eminent of Grecian and Roman orators.

But if the power to persuade exists to a marked degree in female character, it may be accounted for, First, because it has been the only means of redress that woman has ever enjoyed in the domestic compact, and has therefore been cultivated.

Secondly, because the child, either male or female, is impressed with what the mother desires, not by argument but by persuasion. The father commands, the mother persuades. The husband who holds the inferiority of woman would resent argument, in the opposing of his lordly government of home. Tennyson understood this, and wrote :

"Sooth him with thy lighter fancies,
Touch him with thy finer thoughts."

Persuade your husband ; he believes you his inferior. Do not arouse his superior muscularity.

Now by the variable element in her mind or nature, she has developed the powers of intuition and persuasion, and by heredity she has clung to the only means of redress and aggression permitted her with all the conservative force of her nature.

He brings out his idea clearly on page 349, July number. "It is hardly necessary to call attention to the obvious fact, that our conclusions have a strong leaning to the conservative, old-fashioned view of the subject to what many will call the 'male' view of woman. The positions which women occupy in society, and the duties which they perform are in the main what they should be if our view is correct."

I have quoted this to show that so far as his article goes it could have been read to a tribe of exogamists, and it would have met their hearty approval. It claims nothing for the sex but what they have, and has been a long and labored effort to show that the world is treating the female sex justly. On page 350, July number, he indulges in what he would call the office of an evil prophet in any other writer, viz. : "And any attempt to improve the condition of women by ignoring, or obliterating the intellectual differences between them and men, must result in disaster to the race."

The ancients looked upon every man as the property of the state, and in the light of military science set a value upon man just in proportion to the amount of physical fatigue he could

endure, and the courage he possessed. America regards man a social creature, and values him on the light of his development of wealth and social and civil security. It is not his stature and animal courage that entitles him to value, so much as head and heart culture. And it is the work of this persuasive, intuitive mother to give the state a boy, a *man* far in advance of the rank and file of the Roman legion. And the ignorant mother of Athens and Rome could not perform the task.

If this writer would consult the history of woman, he would find material improvement in the sex, and also that this improvement has been in the line of nature's suggestions (but not by a zoological study of woman), but through her own intellectual efforts, and the aid of history and experience.

Zoology offers her assistance at a late day. The countless millions of slave-wives that are dead, rise up and reproach the variable mind of man, that it has been so long in lighting upon the branch of science that unlocks the golden temple of female ideality.

Now, if there is a mental and moral difference in favor of man it must be explained, not from a physiological standpoint, but from a sociological one. We will call attention to a few of the elements in the history of the sex, which will establish the truth of our proposition, and also be in the line of heredity.

The theory of evolutionists is that man came into existence a savage, and that he has reached his present cultivated condition through a long succession of changes, called evolution. If this should be true (but it is not) then we would be safe in beginning here, and we will. Here we must deplore the condition of the female sex. Savage tribes were often at war; in times of war women and children were abandoned or killed. The enjoyment of peace found them destitute of wives; they resorted to the only means of supply, viz.: wife stealing. The captive was no doubt dissatisfied with her condition, and perhaps unable to speak the dialect of the tribe was sullen and morose. She was treated harshly. She was a slave-wife; her

husband was her master, and had power to put her to death. She had sinned against no one. She had committed no crime. She incurred all this sorrow only because she was a woman. She despised her sex. She taught her female children to despise their sex. And in this way they learned to regard it a calamity that they were born women. And they were regarded less favored than men, inferior to men.

We are told by naturalists that when an organ is acquired or possessed by an animal, that long after it has become useless it will adhere to the animal. When once a nation acquires a superstition, it will get use enough to perpetuate it forever. Here is where this barbarous notion of inferiority arose. The condition of the wife in the palmiest days of Greece was a very low one. [See *History of Morals*, Leckey, Vol. II., p. 289].

"In general, however, the position of the virtuous Greek woman was a very low one. She was under a perpetual tutelage; first of all to her parents, who disposed of her hand, then to her husband, and in her days of widowhood, to her sons." That this was a barbarism no one can doubt. She was an uneducated creature, and denied even the advantages allowed the courtesan. The Greek ideal of perfection in art was masculine, and, I have always felt, somewhat vulgar. Their mythology colored every phase of culture, and tainted or poisoned their philosophy when applied to the equal rights of all rational creatures.

Marriage was a loose relation, in nowise sacred, though the husband had all power over the mind and body of his wife. She could not claim as her right his love, or aspire to share in his elevated thoughts or pursuits. Cicero repudiated his wife because she desired a new dowry.

Solomon had 700 wives and 300 concubines. And women were sold, Ex. xxi. 17.

The condition of the female in Egypt was morally very degraded. See Herodotus ii. 60. One can conceive of few scenes more revolting than the feast at Bubostis. Men and women go thither to worship the image of a male, borne by the virgins and worshipped by the whole people. Their temples

like those of Baal, were without a doubt places of extreme degradation, and to the moral character of woman, a fatal snare. And where piety rewards sacrifice, such as may not be described in this article, it is not surprising that woman would soon be regarded in the lowest light. In Chaldæa, religion first connived at, then commanded the vices that degraded the sex.

The beginning of Christianity found society in a gross condition, and while the Scriptures aimed at the emancipation and elevation of the sex, the practice of the church soon threw in the way a barrier of immense weight.

1st. Mariolatry, and the superficial character ascribed to the virgin, was presented as the true aim of woman; a life of chastity, and chastity defined, as perpetual virginity.

2d. A moral censure implied, and even laid upon the married woman, thereby making the married state less honorable than the single. The noblest, purest and Divinest condition of man, branded with the stain of animalism, tended to the injury of the cause of the female sex.

The text of the early code of European law shows the light in which woman was held. She could not own property in her own name; her husband could whip her for an offense against his family law or uncultivated feeling. And when by law he was restricted to the use of a club not larger than his thumb, the world felt she had made a wonderful stride in advance of past ages, when he could put her to death. The age of knight-hood in Europe contributed to the advancement of the sex; it was the creation of an artificial character for the male as well as for the female sex. That under the intense test of modern life, has passed away. Romanism would keep her pure by seclusion; Protestantism by fortifying her moral character against temptation. But Protestantism has something to learn. The silence enjoined upon the sex was a fossil of the past, and a superstition of *Rome*.

In ancient times, her sex did the spinning, and weaving, and manufacture of cloth and garments. These occupations are gone, and she has virtually received no compensation for the

loss. Matrimony has become an asylum, into which she enters too often to escape the shame of being an undesirable charge to parents, or from less laudable motives. And here again, she stands too much in the light of matrimonial alliance, as brought about by the Roman Church, or as held in Athens. Now, the question presents itself in this form. At the responsible age a male and female form a matrimonial alliance, such as is dictated by the church, pure and indissoluble. Is this the end? Nay—not so—they are now peers. In every sense she is his equal, but society at once encumbers her with a code of conventional law that occupies all her time; her mind ceases to grow, a kind of intellectual consumption ensues; at 40 or 50 years of her age, her beauty has passed away, at least, the beauty of youth, and she has no compensation for this waste of physical energies. The very opposite is the case with her husband. His life has been one of intellectual growth; he has kept his place in the world by growing; and at 40 or 50 years, his red cheeks may have faded, and his agile frame grown stiff with rheumatism. But by a natural law of compensatory damages, he has received that intellectual beauty that commands love, respect and admiration. Are they now peers? No! he has out-grown her twenty years. I do not say there are none that keep pace with progress. But that this is the rule.

Now, a few of the barbarisms that cling to this age, are these:

1st. That a woman may not speak in public.

2d. That she cannot do her work in the schools, or in the few places in business assigned her, as well as a man.

3d. That she may not aspire to any of the learned professions. And that she ought not to speak in church, or take a step in advance of the superstitions of the past.

4th. That matrimony is the goal of her being, and that her station in life is to go out shopping, and become an expensive adornment in some man's parlor, where the superior sex may spend their lighter moments.

The names of Abigail, Æthelfred and Zenobia and a host of others, should emphasize the order of nature—FORWARD.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, WITH REFERENCE TO
SPECIAL PERIODS IN HER DEVELOPMENT.

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE, D.D., CAVETOWN, MD.

THE author of this article desires to say, at the outset, that he alone is responsible for the statements made and for the sentiments expressed, and no blame whatever is to rest on the Institution in which he studied, nor on the editor or publisher of this REVIEW. What is here written is not done hastily, but is the result of patient research in the course of his studies. Of one thing the author is fully convinced, that much of what has been written and said has been one-sided, and truth has been made to suffer. In the great controversy between Romanism on the one side, and Protestantism on the other, this is clearly apparent. As an example, in our histories of this great movement, very little account is made of the case as presented by Romish historians, and our histories necessarily become one-sided and unreliable. D'Aubigne furnishes an instance in point. Truth is of more account than either side, and for that we should ever be concerned. Between these two sides, Romanism and Protestantism, we hold *decidedly* to the latter, and do so on the principle of development, believing that it is an advance on the former; but nothing is to be gained for truth by denying and ignoring all the claims which Romanism truthfully can make. It is too late in the day to deny its claims, and to say that it is a system only of falsehood and deception. On the other hand, the truth is that Romanism stands proudly in history as one of its mightiest factors, and by its society, in the Middle Ages, was saved from anarchy and confusion, and that through the influence of the Church on society, civilization originated. The power of the Church was exerted and made itself felt on society in what is called the Dark Ages, with such splendid results. But history never stands still. Its

living force is unceasingly going on. The golden thread which history had been drawing out over its pathway reaches onward and higher—the living factor or principle develops to higher stages and forms, so that what suited one period is unsuited for another, and in this way one age or period is preparatory to another and higher, the present making room for the coming, so that the measure of one age cannot be the measure for the succeeding one. In the great stream of history from the beginning, that which is sacred forms the principal; this continued from age to age, while other powers, playing an important part for the time, passed off and were forgotten. It is so in every age; history develops in the interest of the sacred, this must continue, for the kingdom of Christ is founded upon a rock, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against her. Such is the lesson of the past.

The central point of all history toward which the old order was tending and from which now all history which shall continue proceeds, was reached at last when the promise made to our first parents in Paradise found fulfillment. How wonderful this center, and how beautifully all that was significant was gathered up in Him who is the Lion of the tribe of Judah, when He appeared. The former history, enigmatic in many respects and shadowy, is now coming into light; its significance and meaning are now intelligible. The Lord Jesus Christ reflected light over the past history and reveals the sense and meaning of that wonderful process as given in Old Testament history. Here is a center for all history, towards which and from which it tends and comes, the fountain and root for the ages coming.

The Lord Jesus Christ came not to found an earthly kingdom, as was supposed by many, and by some of His disciples. He came indeed to found a kingdom, but not of this world, yet in the world and for the world, but far above it. "My kingdom is not of this world." He came into this world, fallen from God, as the Second Adam, and as such, the Founder of a new order of life for the world. As in the first Adam all died, so in Him as the second Adam, all, that is, humanity, are made alive. He came to rehead the race.

"Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans."—Irenæus. In Him the race is restored. In the solution of this problem we have no decree from Heaven ordering it, but a conscious entering on the work, solving it by means, by a divinely constituted process, carried forward by human instrumentalities guided and controlled by the Spirit of God. It was a work or problem in the race, and its solution was called for on the same plane. This whole movement has to do with man; hence the entrance of the divine into this human life—the coming down from heaven to earth, and entering into this order, in order to raise it up and restore it to life and peace. It is thus the Christian confesses "I believe that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary." In Him we have the "King Eternal, Immortal, Invisible;" and He is the founder of a kingdom not of this world, which is to endure for ever. A kingdom in which is comprehended everything needed for the restoration of our fallen, sinful life; a kingdom in which is the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, and the life everlasting—one kingdom, apostolic, catholic. Now in Him, in His own person, is comprehended this kingdom—the everlasting fountain, possessing waters for the healing of the nations. This kingdom begins to expand, in idea, the leaven and the mustard-seed, and its development gives us history, indeed, *the* history of the world. Its unfolding, as history, is His life and power in the world, subduing an outlying world and bringing it into His fellowship, delivering it from the prince of this world and leading it into the glorious liberty of the Gospel. So in the Acts of the Apostles, "they were added to the faithful," and this process will "continue until the isles of the sea shall own His sway, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ." Then, too, the special process of development in the individual life, the leaven-like idea of His life, remodeling and remoulding it; making man a new creature; making man like unto Him, and thus gradually making new creatures and a new world out of this fallen, corrupt and sinful order.

Though there was a general longing for the introduction of a kingdom "to restore all things," yet the Jewish mind was not prepared for it in the form in which it came. "Our thoughts are not his thoughts." As darkness opposes light, so the kingdom of this world sought to hinder and destroy this kingdom of grace. At the first Herod—the world-power—sought to destroy Him, and after entering on His ministry, there is always the care so as not to offend, yet never at the expense of truth or of right. Accordingly, He did not at once announce openly and boldly to His hearers the purpose of His mission "that He had come to tear down the narrow limitations of the Jewish community, and in the stead thereof found a kingdom which should go beyond Judaism and embrace the world. He, therefore, never used the word church (*ecclesia*) in His public addresses. Only before His disciples, and only latterly before them—for even they very imperfectly comprehended the matter—did He speak more clearly about His Church. What He almost always spoke of, and that in a way often enigmatical to His hearers, was the kingdom of God, or kingdom of heaven, which was close at hand, or actually come, confining Himself to the expression used previously by the Prophets and adopted by the Baptist. He said He was come 'to preach the Gospel of the kingdom;' and His kingdom formed now the basis of His teachings." (Döllinger—"The First Age of the Church.")

IDEA OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

In the Creed of Christendom, one article of faith is, "I believe in the Holy, Catholic Church." * The salvation or redemption of the race does not lie so much in the form of individual belief or confession as it does in scheme or plan from Heaven, wrought out in history and here appropriated by the individual, and the living power thereof made his own. This

* It is surprisingly strange that among Christian professors the word "Catholic" should give offence. It is erased by denominational orders from the creed, and scouted by Popery haters, in ignorance, it would seem, of its meaning and significance, as one holy, universal body.

plan is the Church of Christ, the Body of the Lord, and in history, is the outward manifestation of His undying life and power. Into contact with it the individual life must come to be made a new creature. So the Apostle, "Christ in us;" "When Christ who is *our life*," etc.; "I live, yet not I," etc. "By the kingdom of Heaven, or of God, He understood generally that divine order of things which He had come to establish. It was a kingdom not of this world, though in the world, to which, as a kingdom revolted from God and ruled by Satan, His own stood directly opposed. And so He answered the question of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God would come, that it was already in the midst of them; its first germs and beginnings, that is, were already present in the persons of Himself and His disciples. . . . This kingdom, moreover, embraces in the words of Jesus, heaven and earth, and the whole course of human history from His time onwards. He represented the growth and spread of His kingdom under the images of the seed developing till it bore fruit an hundredfold, and of the little mustard-seed growing up into a lofty overshadowing tree; a flock of sheep with its shepherd, whose voice it knows; a family, with its master, its men-servants and women-servants; a town, a nation, a kingdom, whose King He was Himself; these are the images by which He exhibited the organic coherence of His Church, the power and authority belonging in this His kingdom to Himself and His representatives." (Döllinger, pp. 27, 28.) We see what the Church is; that it is not of man, but for him; not of earth, but from Heaven. The Church is a heavenly institute coming to men sordid and sinful, and that, while the divine is the golden thread running in the deepest part of this ever-widening current, there is also the human, another important factor in carrying forward towards the end this wonderful work of God. In all Church history we see these factors, and the divine, above all other forces, guarding the truth and assuring order, so that this kingdom is never left to itself. "I am with you always." This is clearly seen over the period in which the

fundamental doctrines of Christianity were formulated, and though the truth and the essential, vital parts of Christianity were denied and suppressed, as in the great Arian controversies, it was only for the time, and under the guidance of the divine factor, the truth gathered force and asserted itself over against error, and is now embodied in the full and decided Confessions confessed by Christendom in all ages. In this way truth is in the Church, and here it is indestructible; this kingdom, too, is destined to continue as truth itself will; "for the gates of hell shall never prevail against her." It is important to recognize this fact, and when the history of this kingdom shows more of the human than of the divine, our faith in this order should only lead us to hold the firmer to it, believing that such orderings can be only for the time being, or until they have accomplished their purposes, and that necessarily the pendulum of history, swinging to one side, must finally swing back and settle in its proper place.

NECESSITY FOR CENTRALIZATION.

It is easily seen that in an age so peculiar as that in which Christianity appeared and began to develop, that a strong arm was needed to uphold and continue it amidst the fierce opposition arrayed against it. It came into the midst of a violent, selfish, sinful people, and therefore, in the beginning, we have much of the supernatural in connection with it. As it came from Heaven it at once appealed to the divine, and so certified to its claims. This is specially set forth in the Acts of the Apostles and early Christianity. It had to take root in order to grow, and hence this divine care. In its progress of expansion it also encountered opposition within itself, and this form of opposition, at times, threatened disastrously. The opposition which it encountered from without and from within, overcome always by virtue of the inherent, divine power in the Church, formed a standing miracle and an argument in favor of its claims. In the Acts of the Apostles we have the beginning of organization. It is not left to caprice or to individual will.

When the difficulty which arose as to the admission of the Gentiles into this kingdom came to be adjusted, we find a body, a power, organized with James at the head, which determined the question and rendered judgment. And that was the law—it was final. And so afterwards, particular men and places, because of position and influence, became centers towards which the eyes of the faithful were directed, and the judgment which was delivered by them, as a general thing, was respected and obeyed. It was felt that there should be a center, a head, to which the participators could look and around which they could come, and thus with an enthusiasm common to them, carry forward the great work. In this period there is this peculiarity already, that according to its needs it developed a form in and by which it could best carry forward this great interest. It demanded a center, and towards that the history tended until it had fulfilled its mission.

Whatever may have been the origin of this center in what is known as the Episcopate, whether it is of apostolic origin or not, it is more to our purpose to see that the period needed it, that the exigencies of the times called for it, that needs, both from without and from within demanded it, and that the power to confer authority and dispense the grace in this kingdom, was comprehended more in its own bosom and from thence conferred upon those called to the various offices in the Church.* “This institution (the Episcopate) comes to view in the second century as the supreme spiritual office, and is retained to this day by all Roman and Greek Christendom, and even by a large part of the Protestant Church. A form of government so ancient and so widely adopted can be satisfactorily accounted for only on the supposition of a religious need, namely, the need of a tangible outward representation and centralization, to illustrate and embody to the people their relation to Christ and to

* That there is a succession from the commencement coming down in this living current is apparent, from which authority is transmitted, but not as held by Episcopalians. Their theory of Apostolic succession is clearly untenable as the history of Anglicanism conclusively shows.

God, and the unity of the Church." (*Hist. of Christian Ch.*, vol. I. p. 414—Dr. Schaff.) As the Church entered on a proper development, being in principle, both as the mustard-seed and the leaven, she had need for a strong system, well organized and directed. Dr. Schaff (p. 420) says: "We cannot, therefore, assume any strict uniformity. But the whole Church spirit of the age tended towards centralization; it everywhere felt a demand for compact, solid unity; and this inward bent, amidst the surrounding dangers of persecution and heresy, carried the Church irresistibly towards the Episcopate." Whatever may have been human in this central power, it is apparent that it was of immense service in the further development of the life and power of Christianity, and then after serving its purpose room is made for some other higher form as it progresses.

THE FULL ESTABLISHMENT OF THIS ECCLESIASTICAL POWER.

The life of the Church is ever the same. As our human life, always the same, may be affected at times by foreign elements, bringing disorder and interfering with its development, but by proper care will again right itself, so the life of the Church. It may meet with opposition and be threatened, but the golden chord remains intact and unbroken. In the development of this power tending to centralization we are met by the same fact. The general current is ever preserved sure; the guiding power of the Holy Ghost continues here the same, and keeps safe the golden thread, and though apparently out of view and deep down in the current, it is sure and abiding. In this early period, as in all others, there is much of the human. In these seats of the Church, as special centres, where the Episcopate had become established, there was an attractive force, and in the course of time these seats obtained an influence and power over others less favored, which were commanding. And in this way, gradually, the power of the Episcopate extended and became established and made itself felt, and thus by degrees arrogated to itself powers and functions which originally did not belong to it nor were claimed by it. It might be an interesting ques-

tion, how at first the claims between these seats originated, and how one after another grew into favor and prominence. As one after another, for various reasons, gained ascendancy others became obedient, until we find this whole ecclesiastical order fully and firmly established at Rome and centered in the person of the bishop there. It continued over a long time, involved a violent struggle, took in special questions and claims, and now power and authority are centered there, and what comes from thence carries with it weight. This is the form which the development of this kingdom took during this period, no doubt the best form, and it is not asserted that the validity of its acts nor the perpetuity of this kingdom depended on the persons occupying these seats, for some of the occupants were sordid, selfish men, unworthy of the place. Notwithstanding that, the kingdom of Christ was here, in this form and in their hands, as instruments, developing itself, guided and taken care of by the Holy Ghost guarding this precious deposit. We see the part which the human took in making the history of this period, and we are enabled to notice the working of these two forces, the divine and human, side by side. Power is now centralized, and from the chair of St. Peter proceeds an authority as from none other. This may seem strange, but without question the spirit of the age required it, its needs demanded it. This becomes clear in the subsequent history.

Whatever questions may attach to this man at Rome, whatever powers and prerogatives he claimed, it is certain that his influence was great and reached far and near. That much is clear. As to spiritual authority and even to his supremacy, there is indeed much confusion for a long period of time, and there was no clear utterance as to this unity over this formative period until the time of Leo I., (†461) who advanced his "claim to be primate of the whole Church." "In him the papacy became flesh and blood." Even with his iron will and superior attainments and talents and other ability needed, it was no easy task to win this claim. He encountered opposition from various sides, and the primary idea of the papacy, vast and extensive in its

proportions as conceived by this clear-headed and shrewd servant of the kingdom, was not in his day, nor has it been to this time realized. One thing, however, is now clear, the kingdom of Christ developing over these centuries, because of inward and outward necessities, has now a visible center of unity, in which resided power and authority, all of which were needed for the ages succeeding. This spirit of centralizing, creating a center of unity, was of incalculable service for this and the succeeding periods. Without question it was the best form, in the then existing condition of society, which could be had for the development of the life of the kingdom of Christ. It assisted in determining and fixing vital principles, settled points in doctrine and assisted in setting forth clearly and distinctly what, in principle, had been at hand long before, a *regula fidei*, as the sign in and by which to conquer. The influence of this man at Rome, both in the spiritual and secular, was extensive, and in him, as the center of unity, one peculiar characteristic of this period, we have the exponent of power wherewith to meet the various forms of opposition to the life of the Church both from within and from without. Though the kingdom of Christ, the Church, had been countenanced by the secular power, other forms of opposition from the world had been preparing. During the pontificate of Leo I. great good came to the Church and the State by means of his influence. On two different occasions the city of Rome was saved from its enemies through his own personal influence. The opposition which the kingdom of Christ was called to encounter came from Northern Europe, when the vast hordes of uncivilized and unchristianized barbarians were let loose and came pouring down over the fairest portions of the continent, overturning and destroying everything in their course. What a grand field for the display of the power and force of the Church; what a glorious problem to Christianize and civilize these untutored, uncultured sons of the forest. Upon the solution of this problem the Church entered, and out of these raw and rough children, ignorant of the gospel of Christ, without civilization, the Church made obedient and faithful subjects

not by the sword, but by the power of the Gospel of Christ. In these peaceful contests we see the strength and glory of this kingdom, civilizing and Christianizing these savage hordes, and to do this splendid work we also see the part that was acted by this man at Rome, the center of unity. There is perhaps no more splendid page in history than that covering this period, and what has heretofore been regarded as dark and gloomy, characterized as "the Dark Ages," now stands out as bright, and by the power and activity of the Church, the wilderness of the North was transformed into a Paradise, and out of the uncivilized masses order was brought, and civilization took the place where confusion and barbarism before reigned. This was effected through the instrumentality of the man at Rome, in whom power was centralized, by whom monasteries, abbeys and ecclesiastical orders were founded, and which proved of such immense benefit to the people. What monuments this kingdom of Christ reared during this period. All honor to the Church of the Middle Ages. The monuments of this spirited age are still seen throughout middle and northern Europe. And is it not a fact that precisely for such a work in the condition of society this period had been preparing measures and means wherewith to do it? How strong the power of the Church now; how this power was centralized and consolidated and established firmly, as upon a rock. And ere long this power was to be tested. In the course of time the secular power acquired strength and began to encroach upon the rights of the Church. When the emperors attempted to intermeddle with affairs pertaining to the Church, is it not clear that a strong central power, having gathered around itself force over the ages already, alone was able to cope with such formidable opposition, and defeat it? It seems that it gathered strength, that it became vigorous and powerful for this period, putting on its strength, and as a strong man began to deal its ponderous blows. The question now was not whether such a Pope should be sustained over against such an emperor or ruler, but rather this: Shall the kingdom of Christ take care of its own interests and have the kingdom of

the world subject, or shall the State rule the Church? That was the question, and the answer can be neither doubtful nor indistinct. The guiding hand in all Church history comes distinctly to view in this period, and that golden thread, however hidden at times, is here also, remaining untarnished and unbroken. When the man at Rome in the chair of St. Peter asserted his power and demonstrated it by placing his heel on the neck of his opponent, or ordering him to remain exposed, barefooted, on pain of penalty, we have only the principle that right, truth, light and justice—yea, rather that the kingdom of Christ, the Church of Christ, can never yield to the power of the world; that she must rule, and not be ruled; that she must triumph over all forms of opposition, and that the secular must become obedient to the ecclesiastical. Who now could calculate the untold injury to light and truth, to the *Ecclesia* of Christ, had the contests in which the emperors and the popes were engaged terminated differently? No. Whatever may have been the character of the popes, all honor to them for their heroic stand, and for their unflinching devotion to right and their noble allegiance to the kingdom of Christ, in which they were permitted to be such grand actors. With their vast influence they accomplished great good for the people, and did much to save society from anarchy and confusion. We have no confidence in the theory that they were sworn enemies of the rights of the people and of light. Through them, as instruments under the guiding hand of the great King of kings, we have civilization, and the splendid results coming with it. But every period calls for special forms. One age grows beyond the preceding one; and when principles, like these developed in the papacy have accomplished their purpose, they become old and then go into decay. This fact shows itself during this period now referred to. The age subsequent to Leo I. and the Middle Ages called for such power as that exercised by these popes. This kingdom could resolutely and successfully grapple with the opposition by means of such instruments, but now that period is past, its peculiar needs have been met, those vast problems have been

solved, power in that form has had its day, and the strength of the papacy is decreasing rapidly. Now the Pope has become an old man, once vigorous, with unflagging powers and will, coping with the most formidable secular powers known, earnestly and successfully maintaining his rights as a servant in the kingdom of Christ, now that is all done, and his power is waning, and he is becoming decrepid. In the great Catholic countries of Europe, such as France, Austria and Italy itself, his power is disintegrating, by far not what it once was, as may be seen in the heartless support the papacy receives in reference to the decrees lately promulgated. It cannot be denied that the Romish Church is not one on the promulgated doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility. These dogmas are not generally accepted by the Church. The truth is, a fair inference may be drawn, viz.: that virtually the papal power has had its day, and room is being gradually made for another period in which will be found a higher stage for the development of the life and power of this wonderful kingdom of God. The work of the papacy is done, and was well done over that critical period which was its bloom, and stands to this day as its glory. Society was preparing to throw off what it conceived as shackles and to go out unfettered into freedom, and it was making itself ready to advance and to take a position higher than in the preceding periods. Towards this the history had been tending. This work we have in the Reformation period.

THE OVERTHROW OF AUTHORITY CENTERING IN THE POPE.

It cannot be denied that society—the Church is now entering on a critical period. The fashion has been to see only glory and an immense stride towards freedom in this period, when the truth is that much of this boasted freedom is only a species of licentiousness. Much of it will not know of any authority, and will own no ecclesiastical laws. Who cannot see this in the denominationalism of our day, and in the licentious idea of freedom, so called. This unquestionably is not the

"Gilded Age." It may be easily imagined that over a period such as that to which in this brief way we referred, especially over a part of the Middle Ages, much of the human was mixed in and thrown fully on the surface, making itself seen and felt. Disorder and corruption succeeded in fastening themselves on the body, even on this kingdom, which, nursed from human, selfish considerations, created sources from which an evil day at last came. This was seen and felt. Before the Reformation dawned, the body had been showing symptoms of disorder, loudly calling for relief. Efforts were made to reform them, and the abuses which had been gradually coming in were being probed, and attempts were made to correct them. What was notoriously needed—and even the good men in the papal Church saw and admitted it—was that a necessity existed for reformation "in head and members." In consequence of the evil which became mixed in with the religious and spiritual during the period succeeding the reformation, a reformation was called for long before the several actors in this reformation period appeared on the stage. "Who will grant me," says St. Bernard, "before I die, to see the Church of God such as she had been in the primitive times?" It is said that he never ceased to admonish the people, the clergy, the bishops and the popes themselves of them. . . . The Roman Church, which for nine whole ages had, by setting the example of an exact observance of ecclesiastical discipline, maintained it throughout the universe to her utmost power, was not exempt from evil; and from the time of the Council of Vienna, a great prelate, commissioned by the Pope to prepare matters there to be discussed, laid it down as a groundwork to this holy assembly "to reform the Church in the head and members." The disorders of the clergy, chiefly those of Germany, were represented in this manner to Eugenius IV. by Cardinal Julian: "These disorders," said he, "excite the hatred of the people against the whole ecclesiastical order, and should they not be corrected, it is to be feared that the laity, like the Hussites, should rise against the clergy, as they loudly threaten us." . . . He

proceeded: "that the clergy are incorrigible, and will apply no remedy to their disorders. When they shall no longer have any hopes of our amendment, then will they fall upon us. The minds of men are pregnant with expectations of what measures will be adopted, and are ready for the birth of something tragic. The rancor they have imbibed against us becomes manifest they will soon think it an agreeable sacrifice to God to abuse and rob ecclesiastics, as abandoned to extreme disorders and hateful to God and man. The little respect now remaining for the ecclesiastical orders will soon be extinguished. Men will cast the blame of these abuses on the court of Rome, which will be considered the cause of them, because it had neglected to apply the necessary remedy." He afterwards spoke more emphatically: "I see," said he, "the axe is at the root; the tree begins to bend, and instead of propping it whilst in our power, we accelerate its fall." . . . "Bodies and souls will perish together. God hides from us the prospect of our dangers, as He is accustomed to do with those whom He destines for punishment; we run into the fire which we see lighted before us." (Bossuet, *Var.*, p. 18, vol. I.)

CONDITION OF SOCIETY.

As already said, over the Middle Ages the kingdom of Christ was a living power—its golden thread continued unbroken, and when we take into consideration the condition of society, the wonder is, not that excesses and short-comings appeared, but that society was not hopelessly ruined. "Let us call to mind," says Balme, in his "*Protestantism compared with Catholicity*," p. 32, "the events which had taken place in the midst of Europe: the dissolution of the decrepit and corrupt Empire of Rome; the irruption and inundation of Northern barbarians; their fluctuations, their wars, sometimes with each other, and sometimes with the conquered nations, and that for so many ages; the establishment and absolute reign of feudalism, with all its inconveniences, its evils, its troubles and disasters; the invasion of the Saracens, and their dominion over a large portion of Eu-

rope; now, let any reflecting man ask himself whether such revolutions must not of necessity produce ignorance, corruption of morals and the relaxation of all discipline. How could the ecclesiastical society escape being deeply affected by this dissolution, this destruction of the civil society? Could she help participating in the evils of the horrible state of chaos into which Europe was then plunged?" That sad consequences growing out of such a condition of society, and threatening its overthrow were averted, is owing to the kingdom of Christ having these heroic men at Rome, who were not afraid to grapple with the enemies of the Church, in the persons of the unscrupulous and selfish emperors and rulers.

After the conversion of the Northern hordes, many of the barbarian chieftains of the North having embraced Christianity, became the friends and benefactors of the Church. They munificently endowed the bishoprics and subsequently the monasteries; they allotted to them large and rich domains; they erected palaces and castles for the bishops and extensive cloisters for the monks of St. Benedict, and for other religious orders which sprang up at a later period. . . . All classes vied with one another in munificence toward the Church and toward her ministers. Splendid churches, spacious hospitals and palatial colleges and universities sprang up all over Europe. Many of these noble edifices still remain, and they are even at this day the admiration of the world, which with all its boasted progress, could scarcely produce anything to equal, certainly nothing to surpass them in grandeur. . . . Others have been diverted from their original destination, and have become the palaces of worldly pride and pomp instead of asylums for the poor of Christ." And now what a grand prize in this untold treasure for the selfish and covetous; and one design of the selfish emperors and rulers was to obtain control and management of these immense seats and their revenues. To do this they sought to "thrust their own creatures into the principal vacant sees and abbeys. The chief merit of the candidate, in their eyes, was his courtly subserviency. In carrying out this wicked scheme for enslaving the Church and virtually

ruining it by foisting into its high places unworthy ministers, they encountered frequent and sturdy opposition from the bishops and abbots; but whether these resisted the usurpation or not, the popes were sure to stand forth on such occasions as the uncompromising champions of the freedom and purity of election, and the independence of the Church. From this sprang many if not most of the protracted struggles between the popes and the German emperors during the Middle Ages." And who will deny this? Withal, this, the thread of history, the divine chord is unbroken, though at times apparently deep in the current. In this place falls the long and protracted controversy on Investitures, waged between the popes and the emperors. "A custom has long prevailed, especially in the Empire (German) that on the decease of the prelates of the Church, the ring and pastoral crozier were sent to the lord emperor. Afterwards the emperor, selecting one of his own familiars or chaplains, and *investing* him with the insignia, sent him to the vacant church, without waiting for the election by the clergy." Again: "At this time the Church had not a free election; but whenever any one of the bishops had entered upon the way of all flesh, immediately the captains of that city transmitted to the palace the ring and pastoral staff; and thus the king or emperor, after consulting his council, selected a suitable pastor for the widowed flock." In cases like these it will not be difficult to determine as to who was right. This contest, as is well remarked, "was one between moral principle and brute force—between reason and passion—between morals and licentiousness—between religion and incipient infidelity. Gregory VII. was driven from Rome by the forces of Henry IV., and he died an exile at Salerno in Southern Italy." In a passage from one of his epistles occurs the following: "I would rather undergo death for your salvation than obtain the whole world to your spiritual ruin. For I fear God, and therefore value but little the pride and pleasures of the world." Is it any wonder that disorders came into this kingdom? and who can fail to see the preparation for the wonderful upheaval in

the following age? Let this be well understood, that the source of the trouble during the stormy period preceding the Reformation lay chiefly in the fact of the studied and persistent opposition and "the settled policy of the German emperors, and subsequently the French kings, to throw every possible obstacle in the way of the appointment of good, disinterested and zealous bishops. They thwarted the popes at almost every step in the continued and earnest endeavors of the latter to secure good pastors to the vacant sees." What a slumbering volcano is here at hand preparing for an eruption. Let an occasion arise, and these embers may soon be fanned into a flame, and a state of things created threatening the peace of all Europe. Far back, in this way we find the sources of the movement now coming. It was not the work of a day—did not fall directly from heaven, and all that was needed was a spirit who would throw himself in the foreground—a spiritual Cromwell, and whom the selfish rulers, avariciously grasping after the goods of the Church, could use for their purposes.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

On the 10th November, 1483, Martin Luther was born. Of his youth it is said by D'Aubigne, "that as soon as he was old enough to receive instruction, his parents endeavored to communicate to him the knowledge of God, to train him in His fear, and to form him to the practice of the Christian virtues. He was taught the heads of the catechism, the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, some hymns, some forms of prayer, a Latin grammar, etc." Pretty good training this, and worthy of Protestant imitation. He was none of the best boys, for while at school at Mansfield, "his master flogged him fifteen times in one day." He said himself: "My parents treated me cruelly, so that I became very timid; one day, for a mere trifle, my mother whipped me till the blood came." He received a good education and was a man of fair talents. He was studious, and through him, to a great extent, the studies of men were turned into another direction from what they had been, and in this way "the reformation brought a

revival of religious feeling, and resulted, by a reactionary influence, in a great quickening of religious zeal within the Catholic Church." (Fisher's Hist. of Ref.) *

It is said by D'Aubigne, "that he received ordination with trembling at his own unworthiness." He was scrupulous to a fault; he was zealous and devoted—traits worthy in any man. The immediate cause which brought Luther into public notice was an attack which he made on a notorious character who had been entrusted with the preaching of the indulgences—a man of the Dominican order. Whether it was a matter of jealousy on the part of Luther—who was naturally vain and conceited, or not, in the then condition of society, with a mind not specially in love with the see of Rome, and having standing behind him the selfish and avaricious emperor, he made the attack with every promise of success. The fact that jealousy existed may be inferred when it is asserted "that the principal members of his order were his warmest advocates, while of the Dominicans the principal members were his opponents."

At the commencement of this history Leo X. occupied the papal chair. He must have been a man of extraordinary attainments, a man of taste and of elevated, enlightened views, and who at this time was concerned in beautifying and adorning the capital, calling about him the best talent in art, science, literature, etc., so that when this trouble in Germany took place and was reported to him, he remarked, smiling, "that it was all a

* It is said, that while in the University of Erfurth, Luther one day found a Bible, which he eagerly read, and it was only after he had entered the convent of the Augustinians at Erfurth, that he "found another Bible, fastened by a chain." So there were Bibles in that day, too. What shall be said to this bit of history, when Protestant historians tell us that "the press had been half a century in operation, and that at least twenty different editions of the whole Latin Bible were printed in Germany only before Luther was born" ? and, "I may remark, that before that event there was a printing press at work in this very town of Erfurth, where more than twenty years after he is said to have made his discovery. . . . Besides the multitude of MSS. copies not yet fallen into disuse, the press had issued fifty different editions of the whole Latin Bible, to say nothing of Psalters, New Testaments or other parts." (Maitland's "The Dark Ages.")

monkish squabble originating in jealousy." It proved, however, no small squabble for the Pope or for the Church. With Luther there was no plan; he evidently had no fixed purpose as to what was to be done, and as he entered on his task "he trembled to find himself alone against the whole Church." He had no desire to break with the Pope, for on the 30th of May, 1518, he wrote to Pope Leo X. thus: "Most holy father, I throw myself at the feet of your holiness, and submit myself to you with all that I have and all that I am. Destroy my cause or espouse it; pronounce either for or against me; take my life or restore it, as you please; I will receive your voice as that of Christ Himself, who presides and speaks through you. If I have deserved death, I refuse not to die; the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. May He be praised for ever and ever. May He maintain you to all eternity. Amen." But besides him there were other actors who became conspicuous as the work progressed, these were the avaricious emperors and rulers. "It is a striking incident, and yet illustrative of the spirit of the age, that the Emperor Maximilian sent word to the Elector Frederic of Saxony to take good care of Luther—we might have need of him some time or other." (Fisher's Hist. of Ref. p. 49.) A great prize was at stake, the immense wealth of the Church. What did men like these emperors and electors care for the kingdom of Christ, who were interfering with her dearest interests and rights continually, and who stood ready to use these men to further their selfish ends? In this wise the way was prepared; one chord after another was weakened and broken, until, at last, this whole field in which the Church had won such splendid victories became lost to the Pope, and continues so until this day. Having thrown off at last the authority of the see of Rome and asserted independence of thought and freedom in religious worship, the gate was opened which let loose this ever-restless spirit; and it is a singular fact that before Luther and his co-laborers closed their eyes on their work, this work had divided into two great Confessions, and these immediately began to subdivide from thence on, with no prospect of

reaching an end, or which the shrewdest calculus can determine when that will be." *

In making an estimate of Luther, who was the principal champion of this movement, history furnishes no evidence that he was a saint, (neither his co-laborers) or that he was better than those who stood opposed to him. † It required no extraordinary men to commence the work; the age had been prepared and now was ready. In his intercourse with his opponents, Catholics and now Protestants, he was coarse and often vulgar. ‡ Melancthon deplored his furious outbursts of tem-

* "The first fifty years that followed on the outbreak of the Reformation witnessed incessant wranglings, disputes and mutual anathematizings between the several Protestant parties; first between Luther and Zwinglius, next between the rigid Lutherans and the Crypto-Calvinists, and so on. When, after long intrigues and tedious negotiations, the Chancellor of Tübingen, James Andrea, succeeded, about the year 1586, in obtaining acceptance for the so-called *Formula of Concord*, the theological strife receded from the arena of public life into the school; and for the whole century that followed, the Protestant Church was distinguished for a narrow-minded, polemical scholasticism and a self-willed, contentious theology. The Lutheran orthodoxy, in particular, degenerated more and more into a dry, spiritless, mechanical formalism, without religious feeling, warmth and unction. . . . The Protestant orthodoxy, having succeeded by anathemas and persecution in reducing to temporary silence the first commotions of the yet impotent Rationalism, sank into soft repose on its pillow. But, in the midst of German Protestantism, an alliance had been formed, which at first appeared to be of little danger, nay, to be even advantageous, but which soon overthrew the whole scaffolding of doctrine that the old Protestant orthodoxy had raised up, and precipitated Protestant theology into that course which has in the present day led it entirely to subvert all the dogmas of Christianity, and totally to change the original views of the Reformers." (*Der Protestantismus in Seiner selbst Auflösung*, von Einem Protestanten. Schaffhausen, 1843, pp. 291-3.)

† "Whoever supposes that the Reformers were exempt from grave faults and infirmities, must either be ignorant of their history, or have studied it under the influence of a partisan bias." (Fisher, *Hist. of the Ref.*, Preface, page 8.)

‡ "In confirmation let any one turn to the famous *tisch reden*, of 1350 pages, collected and published by those who were his intimate friends. It is curious how he talks on nearly every subject—thus: 'May the name of the Pope be——. 'If I thought that God did not hear my prayer, I would address the devil.' 'I owe more to my dear Catharine and Philip than to God Himself.'

per. "I tremble when I think of the passions of Luther; they yield not in violence to the passions of Hercules." An exceedingly interesting part of his life is that when he fell into the snare of the woman he afterwards married; and Erasmus had some very ugly things to say reflecting seriously on his moral character. No wonder that his love-scenes became nauseating to Melancthon and his best friends. His *tisch reden*, much of which is worthy, contain too much that is discreditable, undignified and downright shameful. Associated as he was with selfish men,* who had an eye not on this kingdom or its advancement, but on its wealth, the work went on, and now commenced the secularizing of property and diverting it from the legitimate use for which it had been set apart. Those immense treasures, some lasting to this day, passed beyond the reach of the Pope, and had to do service otherwise and in other ways than originally designed. That same spirit, vandal-like, lies at the root of the English Reformation under Henry VIII. These are facts, and as Protestants, let us be just to history.

Whatever may be the merit or demerit of this wonderful work, one thing is clear, the kingdom of Christ was not destroyed; that golden thread remains intact, and was beyond the reach of the passions of the men participating in this peculiar period. Success depended not on the character of the men so much. It was not man's cause. The waters which had been dammed up had to make way by overflowing. History does not take time to stop; truth unfolds itself, if it must be, by violence. It knows no men, joins itself to none, only makes use of them coming in the way for its high and holy purposes. Men may be ordinary and sinful, as in the Old Testament Saul and David—it ties itself to no one; but truth develops to

'God has made many mistakes. I would have given Him good advice, had I assisted at the creation. I would have made the sun shine incessantly; the day would have been without end,' and so on *ad nauseam*.

* As an illustration, take the case of the Landgrave of Hesse, one of the strong defenders and supporters of the Reformation, a wretched bigamist, by consent, as the original document testifies.

higher stages and forms. Whatever may have been gained, it was the truth which advanced, but as such, only for that period, and under no circumstances could that form become the measure of truth for the periods following. To think of making that the form or the mould into which truth or Christianity is to be cast for our age or any future age, is simply narrow. To say or dream that future Christianity must be fashioned after the type of the Lutheran as it stood in Reformation days, is simply to make that the gauge for all future time. In looking over the centuries succeeding the Reformation, it would be very difficult to tell where the type comes in, the vast bulk having nothing whatever distinctive of Lutheranism, if you take away that talismanic name. No: It is not desirable that it should be so. The kingdom of Christ is always expanding, always changing, and yet ever the same; and on this ground we stake the advance made in this period of the Reformation. Who were the popes? Some of them, no doubt, bad men—who these men figuring during these days? only as others were, and no more. The kingdom has developed beyond the papacy, and to make transitions to Rome is going backward, and giving up the very idea of development, surrendering so much of truth. God is in history, the Lord is in His Church, He takes care of His own, and that golden thread will ever be unbroken, but extends onward. He will bring order out of confusion. This development will go on; special periods will require special characters. As in the past, there was a necessity for peculiar phases in the development of this kingdom of Christ, in order to meet the wants, as in the episcopate, and then on in the development of the papacy, and now again into something higher, which age, as the preceding ages, has its dangers needing to be guarded, so now are there signs in which we hope we are able to discern a tendency to escape from the extremes which this period begat. Here we have the emancipation of the intellect, and the extreme tendency to throw off all authority, and run into independency, which is apparent in the terrible scramble of vying with one another to be lord only over self and to own

no other authority, which we see especially in the multiplication of sects swarming over the land. And what is more, there is no power now at hand which can control or reduce this spirit to order. Even Lutheranism is not one with itself, excepting in name. In the spirit of narrow exclusiveness, it cuts off and excludes bodies bearing the same name, until it is really a small body among the Israel of the land. It fares here as others. But history moves onward. The golden thread starting on the day of Pentecost, followed immediately by the Holy Catholic Church, remains unbroken here, and is untarnished, stretching all over the early ages of Christianity, at times lying on the surface, and then at other times, possessing special peculiarities, sinking deeper, but never broken or lost, making its way onward over the Middle Ages down to the Reformation, and from thence onward, is making its way in the Protestant stream over the three centuries gone, and on into the future. Christ has had His Church always; rent and torn at times, as it may be, His power and grace are never absent; the thread is unbroken, always here.* And as there was a tumbling of waters over the fall in the days of the Reformation, creating the discordant notes heard in our Protestant denominationalism, and growing away from the Pope, and every year more so, may we not hope that the time will come, in an after period, whose peculiarity it will be to sweep off and efface all these denominational differences? Who will say that our denominationalism stands as the necessary form for the development of the kingdom of Christ? yea, rather, is it not a terrible hindrance to its growth and progress? May we not hope that the time will speedily come when there will be one stream, and when both Catholic and Protestant will be taken up into a higher unity, and peacefully flow on, when all denominational names and distinctions will be

* It is true that all over the history of the Church, divisions and sects arose, but generally they passed away in the course of time, having been branded as heretical by the authority of the Church; so that over them this kingdom stood, absorbing and outliving them. In some way that authority must be asserted in Protestantism; it must at some time become a unity.

swept into utter forgetfulness, and when there will be but one fold—one Church? The Church of the future will know no such distinctions as are now known, and the form in which the Church now exists, where each party displays its own banner, under which only it will march in the grand army of Christ, or not march at all, will be known only in name; and this body or kingdom, now rent and torn, will be united as one body, not under pope or bishop or name of man, but under the broad fold of the cross of Christ, and as one body having one King, the Lord Jesus Christ, the end will come, in the new heavens and in the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

ART. IV.—COLLEGE COMMENCEMENTS.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M.

THESE pleasant, and, in most cases, profitable exercises are an essential part of our Educational System. To omit them would be to leave out of the programme one of the most notable features of the Collegiate work. Their universal prevalence, and the deep interest with which they are invested in the eyes of the people, make them the legitimate objects of public criticism. Both the good and the bad sides of these popular and interesting occasions, should be held up to public inspection—the one for approval and imitation, the other for disapproval and rejection. The close relation in which they stand to the general cause of education, as well as the important influence which they naturally exert upon the young and rising generation, makes it imperative for the friends of sound intellectual and moral culture, to insist that these popular exercises be so conducted as to exert always and only a salutary influence upon those in attendance.

The point we wish to make is this—that whatever, in connection with these annual gatherings and the several exercises entering into them, is inconsistent with the best interests of the young, or the dignity of the occasion, should be carefully and scrupulously excluded from these public entertainments—that their moral tone and legitimate tendency should be such as to refine and elevate the moral sentiments of those who patronize them either as students or visitors—that they should be characterized by a spirit of unquestioned propriety and moral dignity—that, in short, they should be eminently proper in themselves, and, in their bearings, confessedly worthy of the distinguished and dignified character of these interesting occasions.

Now, in order to meet these requirements, a number of things are necessary; and, in order to show what these things are, and how they must be constituted to meet the demands of the case, it will be proper to take up successively the several items which enter into these Commencement exercises.

And, first, as regards the external and less important aspects of the question. These festivities necessarily require some attention to the proprieties of life—to suitable external arrangements—the exercise of artistic skill and taste in the customary decorations, or special preparation and ornamentations which usually accompany these annual festivities and established literary entertainments. Such ornamentations are eminently proper, and afford the youthful aspirants for academic honors an opportunity to exercise and test in a practical way their æsthetic culture and progress in artistic skill. This part of the programme, therefore, is not only proper and praiseworthy in itself, but also of great practical use to those engaged in making these exquisite preparations, as well as elevating and refining in their influence on the general audience. So far these things of beauty and of taste have our hearty approval. There is, however, a tendency at the present day to overdo this part of the programme—to be extravagantly lavish in the getting up and display of these outward adornments—to render the thing ridiculously fantastic and repulsive by a too elaborate and law-

less style of ornamentation. We object not to what is beautiful or even brilliant in these decorations. They are eminently proper and right, if kept within just bounds, and the work be executed with judgment and taste. These are essential conditions to their legitimate use and beneficial effects. The objectionable feature in this matter appears in the *disregard* of these reasonable demands or essential conditions. The wrong consists, not simply in the display of a vitiated taste, and in the unfavorable impression thus made upon the refined and cultivated auditors; but, also, in the excessive expenses incurred, and the oppressive burdens imposed on the more immediate participants in these festive occasions—the students themselves. Not unfrequently these are taxed far beyond their means in order to meet the enormous expenses of Commencement-day and its accompaniments. In some instances these extravagant outlays, extending naturally through the entire course of collegiate training, are so burdensome as to exclude some of the most worthy students from pursuing a full and regular course of study, and sharing in the pleasures of graduation. That this is a crying evil, and one that calls for speedy and thorough correction, we think, must be clear to all men. While the thing itself is eminently proper and legitimate, its abuse is an abomination. Were this decorative extravagance an isolated fact, and not an index to the existence of a long series of similar evils, running through and poisoning the entire course of collegiate study, the thing might be endured, or at least treated with some indulgence; but connected as it is with our present educational movements generally, it deserves the unqualified condemnation of all men who have at heart the welfare of the rising generation.

Intimately related to this objectionable feature in the general preparation for these literary entertainments and to the indulgence in extravagant ornamentations, is the equally reprehensible custom of overwhelming the speakers on such occasions with a multitude of floral offerings and other presents. These offerings, in their present extravagant form, are not only a nuisance, in that they interfere very materially with the pro-

gress of the exercises themselves, and not unfrequently embarrass the youthful speakers, especially when several of them follow each other in close succession, but they likewise display a bad taste in that they are generally distributed with an unequal or partial hand—often discriminating unjustly in favor of some brainless coxcomb, whose time and attentions have been chiefly bestowed upon the fair sex instead of the legitimate studies of the college course. This may seem to be a small matter—unworthy of criticism; but those who think so may be profitably reminded that the world is made up of little things, and that whoever neglects the minor and less showy things in the conduct of his life and the management of his business, will inevitably fail in those things which are deemed greater and of more importance. Let no one, therefore, despise the day of small things!

But we pass on now, to notice another feature in these modern Commencement exercises—we mean *Class-days*, *class-day* histories, prophecies, and the other special and extraordinary concomitants of these festive occasions. We do not in the least object to these matters—nay, we rather admire them, and regard them as a very pleasant and appropriate feature in these annual gatherings. Commencement day is invested with peculiar interest to the students, generally, and especially to those about to close their college course, and enter upon the stern realities of practical every-day life. It severs, forever, their connection with the college and its intellectual struggles in the special sense in which these have existed for them hitherto, and imparted such peculiar interest and importance to their life. When, now, after a long and tedious course of study, they find themselves on the verge of departure from the college halls and of separation from their fellow-students, why should there not be a careful review made of the past six or eight years of intellectual companionship and social intercourse? And why should there not be a thoughtful look cast into the dark and portentous future by the student at this interesting point of his history?

Class-days, accordingly, may serve a good and noble purpose in that they bring into vivid review the past history of those who are most immediately interested. They serve to remind the members of the graduating class, in a general way at least, of their weaknesses and deficiencies as well as of their earnest and successful struggles in the cause of mental and moral culture. They may thus be made the means of great good in the way both of warning and of encouragement. The imperfections of the past, being held up to view and earnestly contemplated from a point so interesting and impressive as the last day of assembly in the character of a college class, will appear in their true light and naturally call forth efforts for their correction and avoidance in the coming and eventful future. Whatever has been of a proper and noble character in the past conduct of the students, will as naturally awaken in them sentiments of gratitude to Him who is the source of all our blessings, and at the same time stimulate them in the path of duty as regards the future. All this, however, requires a certain degree of seriousness and earnest effort on the part of those interested. Are these Class-days and their concomitants generally characterized by these qualities? Are they not in most instances marked by levity and blighted by a spirit of indifference as regards the higher and nobler ends of life? The so-called history of the class is usually composed of facts or fancies rather of the most doubtful propriety, and these pretended facts, which, if they had any real existence in the history of the students, would far better have been buried in oblivion than paraded before the public, are often so highly embellished, or distorted rather, by the historian of the day, that they would hardly be recognized even by the ostensible actors themselves, except under present circumstances. And what is still worse and far more damaging in the business, is, that even the little that is really true and susceptible of a nobler application, is usually turned into the purely comic, and thus made as ridiculous as possible. Senseless buffoonery, far more than simplicity, earnestness, and godly sincerity, is found to be the ruling spirit in these public

assemblies. Frequently, too, a spirit of coarseness and vulgarity assumes the reins and controls the exercises of these interesting occasions. In this way all the good that might otherwise be accomplished is inevitably lost and a vast amount of mischief done. The whole occasion is stripped of its proper nature and higher significance.

What, then, should be the distinctive character of these Class-days and their accompaniments? We answer—that they should always be characterized by a spirit of seriousness and propriety commensurate with the dignity and importance of the occasion—that only such incidents, in the history of the class, as are calculated to benefit the members, and to leave a pleasant and salutary impression on *their* minds, as well as on the minds of the assembled friends, should be called up and embodied in the history; and these incidents should be so grouped, and represented in such a manner, as to form the most pleasing picture and produce only the most happy feelings in the minds and hearts of the persons about to separate from each other—to separate in all probability forever! The whole scene or transaction should be of such a lovely and charming character as to call up at all times, when reviewed, the most pleasant feelings, and, thus, serve them as an enduring source of pleasurable emotions. The picture should be a “thing of beauty and a joy forever.” Especially should this be the case with the history of the past; and whatever is of an opposite character, in its nature or effects, should be carefully excluded.

As regards the future, represented by the prophet and his predictions, the same general remarks hold good. These so-called prophecies could be made the means of real pleasure and encouragement to the young men, as well as of solemn warning and admonition, if they were of the proper character, animated only by a spirit of generosity; of kindness, and of sincere love to the members of the graduating class. Not a single unpleasant fact should enter into the prophetic image—not an unkind remark should be indulged—not even the slightest hint or insinuation of an improper nature should mar the exquisite

beauty and kindliness of the picture. When duty and the spirit of fidelity or genuine friendship require that anything in the way of warning or earnest admonition should be spoken, it ought to be done in the most delicate and agreeable way—with the absence of all harshness or malice, or levity and recklessness even. When so conducted these Class-day exercises, whether in the way of history and old-time reminiscences or of prophecy and probable occurrences in the future, could be made both useful and entertaining.

These reflections, thus hastily thrown together, are pretty fairly reflected in an editorial found in the *Reformed Messenger* of July 9th, which reads as follows:

“What are known as Class-days have come to be an established institution at nearly all of our Colleges. Faculties and Trustees have virtually recognized them by conceding a given time for their celebration, and the exercises have been formulated into regular programmes, which are followed with little variation at the different schools. In the main they are unobjectionable. A little mirth in the presence of grave teachers and friends, when the course of study is ended, and Seniors, free from the restraints of the past, are looking into the roseate future, is well enough. The realities of life come soon enough, alas, with their sombre hues, and there is no use to let imagination throw a pall over everything from the beginning. It would paralyze the energies of any young man, if he should be compelled to enter upon the duties that are to meet him in life, crowded upon him from the first. The flush of youth is often as important to success as the experience of age, and it is no part even of Christian faith to brood mournfully over the broken life of man. But it is easy enough to see that these Class-days are very liable to be abused. The whole occasion is animated by the thought, that ‘all jokes are free in harvest,’ and that Speakers, like the king’s jesters, may, if they will, indulge in that, which, at other times, would be impertinent and punishable. There is, for instance, as we understand it, a prophet, who takes the peculiarities of his classmates, expands them in

the future, and forms them into grotesque pictures; and there is a historian, who gathers up the incidents of class-life, and presents them in any light he chooses. And it requires no malice, but only a little indiscretion, to give these speeches such a turn as to make them coarse and insulting. There is here an opportunity to give a professor, whose popularity may be in inverse proportion to his fidelity, a 'cut' before the public. And, indeed, the temptation is, to call some teacher by a nickname, or relate some incident which serves to caricature him. Some people are not alive to such thrusts; their feelings could not be hurt with anything less than a club; but, as a general thing, men of high natural endowments, or such as have attained eminence through difficulties, are possessed of extreme sensibilities, and they may wince under thoughtless words, although they may have too much composure or grace to betray any emotion. It surely cannot be pleasant to any one, to find those, upon whom he has spent much care and labor, so inconsiderate as to place him in an unenviable light before a promiscuous company of friends, just when the relation between teacher and student is about to be severed. It seems unappreciative and ungrateful, even though no disrespect is intended, and it puts a boy in the light of one who has been cared for and educated by the self-sacrifice of a parent, and then speaks of his father as 'the old man,' or his mother as 'the old woman.' This is all the more inexcusable, because so many pleasant things occur during the college course that might be called to mind on Class-day, to the exclusion of all that could be regarded as questionable by persons of the most refined taste; and we are sure that those, who are betrayed into making jests of what may have planted a thorn in the breasts of others, will not feel any better for it in after life. If the case were reversed, and the President of a college, in a Baccalaureate address, or a Professor, in a parting speech, should remind a student of some ignorant blunder in the recitation-room, that fixed a name upon him and gave rise to a traditional joke, or of some breach of morals for which the mercy that shields from dis-

grace had to be asked, the allusion would be looked upon as humiliating and galling. Why then should not hard-working teachers have the same immunity from unpleasant mention?"

These sentiments are just and discriminative. They do not condemn Class-days unconditionally; but they do condemn the shameful abuses of these days of unrestrained freedom and lawless impertinence. What, in itself, is perfectly harmless or even praiseworthy, may easily be turned into a nuisance. So with these class-day exercises.

If, now, we pass from these gatherings of the students on the campus to the halls of the Alumni dinner, we shall find ourselves in pretty much the same atmosphere, so far, at least, as the prevailing spirit of the occasion is concerned. The same general want of dignity and propriety will be found to characterize the exercises here as on the outside. The speeches, let off in answer to the toasts offered, are composed mainly of elements furnished by a species of coarse wit and undignified buffoonery, often as inapt and pointless as they are coarse and unworthy of the occasion and of the persons represented. Here and there we meet with a pleasing exception—a green oasis—where this dull and senseless trifling is relieved by the genial flow of genuine good humor and the ready sallies of native wit, sparkling, keen and pointed, or possibly by a solid, edifying speech, replete with quick and lofty thought, spoken by some pure-minded, undaubed, genuine child of nature—gifted with genius and a spirit of more earnest mould. Such outbursts of genuine humor and solid sense loom up in the midst of these intellectual and moral wastes, with the grace and beauty of a blooming oasis, whose fragrant presence, like the early dew, sheds sweetness and cheer over the jaded spirits of weary and disappointed auditors. How grandly do these higher moral and intellectual entertainments stand out to view! How marked is the contrast between them and the insipid commodities usually served up on these festive occasions! Who, without previous personal experience, could imagine that a company of young men, highly cultured, and of old men, too, grave Doctors of

Laws, of Medicine, of Philosophy, and of Divinity—in the character of a friendly re-union and social gathering after years of separation and exhaustive labor—could find nothing better, loftier, or more worthy of their attention than “cracking jokes” and inflicting on each other, and on the listening crowds, these crude and insipid commodities, instead of generously entertaining them, and each other, with specimens of sweet, sparkling, edifying discourse! In this demand for something more solid and elevating than the current fare—for something sparkling with truth and wit and genuine good humor, ministering liberally alike to heart and mind, there is nothing extravagant—nothing repugnant to the social character of these annual gatherings, or in the least inconsistent with the hearty cheer and gayety of spirit which should characterize these festive occasions.

But, it may be asked, why object to what seems to be universal and inevitable in these literary entertainments? Why interfere with the current habits and preferences of those who choose to spend their time and energies in this particular way, and whose displeasure is almost certainly incurred by any interference with their chosen method of conducting these affairs? To these and similar questions, which might be raised, we reply that these literary entertainments are not in any exclusive sense mere private affairs, and that the spirit or form, by which they are to be characterized, is not, therefore, a matter of individual preference. The public is largely interested in these annually recurring festivities; and especially are those, whose sons and daughters are to be educated and trained at these public Institutions, interested in what is to constitute the reigning spirit and moulding power of these literary and scientific centres. Hence they are justly entitled to know, and, indeed, morally bound to know and be concerned as to what is to be said and done at these annual Commencements—these seasons of public festivity. Are our sons and daughters—the young and inexperienced and most interesting portion of the rising generation—to be trained to earnestness, to virtue, and to a serious view of life and its dread responsibilities, or are they to

be moulded morally and intellectually by the base and ruinous spirit of levity and sport—the spirit of indifference—of irreli-gion—of senseless buffoonery? Surely, it ought not to be forgot-ten that the peculiar spirit which crops out on these public oc-casions, at the close of the college year, is but the concentrated life and essence of the demoralizing spirit, which, like a poi-soned stream, runs through the entire course of study, and gives shape and form to modern college life universally. Is it not a notorious fact, known and felt by all earlier students, that the reigning spirit of our literary and theological institutions of the present day is essentially, and, we may add, sadly differ-ent from the spirit which was in vogue only a quarter of a cen-tury ago. That the prevailing spirit of the present age, in our Colleges, is as elevated, as noble, and as praiseworthy as that which characterized the current of college life in former pe-riods, it seems to us few men would be willing to assert. The superiority of the earlier over the later life, current in our lit-erary and theological institutions, we think, must be evident, and should naturally commend itself to the judgment of all ear-nest and thoughtful men. The manly spirit of order, the gen-uine seriousness, the gravity, and the ardent devotion of the students to their studies and other duties, were marked features of college life in those earlier and better days, standing in broad contrast with the spirit and conduct so generally preva-lent at the present day—extravagant, wild, and disorderly.

In reference to this whole subject we need a radical reform. Parents and guardians, seeking the welfare of their children, and finding their pecuniary resources not over-abundant, are deeply sensible of the difficulty of educating their sons and daughters, with safety and convenience, at our public institu-tions. And these painful apprehensions regarding pecuniary troubles, are accompanied and aggravated by the still greater anxiety occasioned by the frivolous and extravagant spirit which largely characterizes the life and conduct of students in our literary institutions, as indicated in these closing exercises. What security have earnest Christian parents that their chil-

dren will escape the evil and demoralizing influences which are everywhere at work, and make themselves so painfully prominent in connection with these otherwise interesting and appropriate festive occasions which we have now had under review. The danger is imminent, and needs to be carefully guarded against. The anxiety of parents and guardians in this respect is perfectly legitimate, and merits our highest regard and commendation.

We are well aware that these strictures on College Commencements, and, indirectly, on college life in general, will, as is usually the case in all earnest efforts to correct current abuses, be unsparingly denounced as the effect and outburst of a morose and gloomy temper—as evidence of an unsocial and selfish spirit that deserves to be pitied or repelled rather than earnestly heeded and laid to heart. It is, indeed, difficult, in the present state of things, to gain the attention of the public in any effort to expose and correct prevailing irregularities. Any one who ventures on this forbidden ground is, ipso facto, taken to be an officious and malevolent troubler, and unpardonably impertinent for thus presuming to meddle with other people's business—with what is generally supposed to lie beyond the bounds of his own legitimate concern. The well-meant advice of the bold and unwelcome intruder is scornfully rejected, and he himself sternly remanded to his own proper domain, with the wholesome admonition to look after and mind his own business. But to all such scornful, though well-meant counsel or advice, and its self-complacent authors, we would respectfully reply, that this matter of exposing and correcting of evils is pre-eminently our business—that, in a very important and startling sense, every man is his brother's keeper, and is accordingly bound to look after him and his true interests, and, that, in doing so, he only discharges his solemn and divinely appointed duty and nothing more. He may not, indeed, merit any special applause or commendation for what he does in this regard; but neither does he deserve the scorn and merciless denunciation of his fellow-men for making proper efforts in this

direction. To expose and correct popular evils is a work transcendently noble, godlike, and worthy of all praise!

But, not to weary the reader with any further remarks on this branch of our general subject, and so appear to be extravagantly bent on exposing irregularities, we will pass on to notice the Commencement exercises more properly so-called, and to offer in regard to them a few practical suggestions.

The members of the graduating class, above all others, are interested in this part of the general programme. They have, in the judgment of charity, earnestly and nobly toiled through a course of mental and moral training, extending over six or eight years, and now make their appearance in public to furnish evidence of their industry and application to study by the delivery of original orations. Their industry and faithfulness in the prosecution of their prescribed studies, as well as the extent of their general reading and miscellaneous studies, together with their natural endowments, will be mainly estimated by their failure or success in these last efforts; and their success here will largely depend on the moral support they receive from surrounding circumstances on Commencement day itself. If these are *favorable*, and thus soul-inspiring to the orators, they will be likely to succeed; if otherwise, they will just as likely fail. The honor and reputation of the speakers are at stake. They have, accordingly, a perfect right to expect the earnest and most respectful attention of the audience present, as well as their generous sympathy and personal interest in the exercises of the day. Not only the students themselves, but also their particular friends, who have come together from all parts of the country to witness these public and closing efforts of their beloved children and wards, are personally concerned to have everything pass off pleasantly and with success. Any mishap on the part of a graduate, on Commencement day, is justly considered a public misfortune—a source of sincere regret to all right-minded and judicious persons. Everything, therefore, that could in the least interfere with or disturb the solemnities of the occasion, or, in any way, act injuriously on

the success of the speakers, should be scrupulously avoided. Strict order should in all cases be preserved; and everything should be done to encourage the youthful orators in their noble aspirations, and enable them to appear to the best possible advantage. All the surroundings should be such as to inspire the graduates with courage and faith in the assurance of the most perfect sympathy on the part of the audience. But here, precisely, comes in the difficulty in the case of very large and promiscuous assemblies. The deep and absorbing interest attaching to these public occasions or literary entertainments, and, especially, the very novel and sportive way, in which the accompanying exercises are frequently conducted, usually brings together large and disorderly crowds of persons, who come actuated by mere curiosity, or a desire to see and to be seen. Their only object, apparently, in being present, is to have a little sport; and this they generally take with a vengeance. Prominent among these disorderly disturbers of the peace, and foremost in causing annoyance to the orderly and more serious portion of the auditors, are the lolling beves of trifling, gay, and love-sick girls, with their smitten beaus, simpering, giggling, and talking the live-long day. Order and propriety, in such cases, are wholly out of the question. Respectable persons, who have come to hear the orations and enjoy the exercises of the occasion, are bound to be annoyed by these pests of society and deprived of all their anticipated pleasures—returning to their distant homes with saddened hearts and disappointed hopes; and all this because of the presence and disorderly conduct of this unworthy class—this low-bred rabble—with its senseless giggling and aimless talk. The whole thing is abominable—an unmitigated nuisance.

Could not our College authorities inaugurate some measures by which to abate this nuisance, and effectually to remedy the evil complained of in these strictures? Is there no way to get rid of these pests of society, and have the rights of decent and orderly people protected on such occasions? It is high time that something should be done in this line, and a more auspi-

cious time ushered in, to the honor of our literary institutions and the comfort of their patrons. Some shrewd Yankee of the inventive class could secure for himself enduring fame, and the sincere thanks of all men "good and true," by the invention of an effectual oral gag or mouth-closing apparatus, adapted to be used on such occasions. If such an invention be not forthcoming, then let the good sense and determined efforts of the decent and order-loving portion of our people seek to accomplish this desirable object in some other way. But by all means have this shameless and abominable nuisance abated! Let us see to it, that, on these interesting occasions, not only the honor of the graduating class and their companions in study, but also the rights and privileges of the friends present, and especially the dignity of our literary and theological institutions be fully maintained—that, in short, all the friends and patrons of these institutions be effectually secured against the unpleasant annoyances which are now so common on these Commencement-days. When this desirable end shall have been attained, and the earnestness, good order, and exquisite proprieties of earlier times are once more fully restored, then a brighter day may be expected to dawn upon our public institutions—our Colleges and Theological Seminaries!

ART. V.—ORATORY IN PREACHING.

BY REV. PHAON S. KOHLER.

AFTER our blessed Saviour had risen from the dead, and was about to ascend to the throne of His kingdom, He charged His disciples: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Redemption had been wrought, and His kingdom established; but of what use is redemption, unless it is appropriated, and of what use is the establishment of His Kingdom unless it has subjects? To the realization of these ends Christ sent out His disciples "into all the world." They were to herald the glad tidings of salvation to every creature. Peace had been made with God, and the celestial kingdom had been founded among the children of men. This was too great a matter to be left to itself. It was to be carried out in its development through the instrumentality of men—not by physical force, but by moral force. This force was to be expressed more particularly in preaching. He, who knew what is in man knew that man could best be reached through the channel of speech. Man is most impressed when the eye and ear are delighted as well as the mind and heart. Indeed, there is a close connection between the physical and mental powers, so that when the former are aroused, the latter are correspondingly invigorated. "The soul perceives the more truth and feels it more keenly, when the eye traces the lineament of the truth upon the countenance of the speaker, and the ear catches the vibrations of it from lips which have been touched as with a live coal from off the altar." How, then, could Christianity, which was to be in its essence a life-giving principle, be better communicated than through preaching?

The very command which our Saviour gave to His disciples, and which is also imperative on His ministers of every age,

implies that the gospel should not only be preached but that it should be preached effectively. Thus, they who proclaim the glorious news of the everlasting salvation, must endeavor to make their preaching as powerful as possible. The realization of this power may be denominated "oratory in preaching." But before defining what this element in preaching is, it is necessary to consider oratory in its general sphere.

This branch of education, as a special study, was first cultivated to any remarkable extent among the Greeks,—here it budded, and here it bloomed. It was known to them by the name of *ῥητορικὴ*, which was derived from *ῥήτωρ*, a speaker. Hence it was something active. The Greeks were an active people, consequently the product of their mind was the same. Demosthenes, when asked what the first thing in "Rhetoric" was said "action." In his mind it was not something destitute of life; but the real embodiment of a nation's vitality. From these facts we see that the word "Rhetoric" was not used in the same contracted sense among the ancients as it is now-a-days among us. With them it corresponded with what we term "oratory."

In order to obtain a clearer conception of what oratory really is, it is necessary to examine the various definitions, which have been given to it by different individuals. Socrates calls it "The art of persuasion."* Aristotle's definition is essentially the same though in a little different wording: "The power of inventing whatever is persuasive in discourse."* Among the Greeks the great end of all oratory was persuasion. The Romans adhered to essentially the same principle in oratory as the Greeks did. Cicero defines it as "speaking in a manner proper to persuade."* When we come down to Quintillian, we find him objecting to this idea of oratory. "For," says he, "others, besides an orator, have the power of persuasion by their speech, and of effecting the purpose they design. On the other hand the orator is not always successful in persuading; nay, this

* Quintillian's Institutes, B. II., Ch. XVI.

properly, may not be his purpose, or if it is, it may be a purpose in common with others of possessions very different from that of an orator."* After having thus commended the definitions of his predecessors, he defines it in three words, *bene dicendi scientiam*.* Coming down to the old French Rhetorician P. Lami, we hear him say: *L'idée de la Rhétorique comprend l'art de persuader, aussi bien, que celle de parler*.† And without losing sight of our own age and country, the definition of Dr. Worcester may be quoted: "The art of speaking with the design to convince or persuade." Such is oratory as it appears in different ages and countries. Its principal element at first has been, and still is, "action." But in this as in every thing else, the best definition can only be given after it has been fully analyzed.

ITS ETHICAL ELEMENT.

Speech is an acquirement, and not an innate element in man. It is true that man is born with the possibilities of speech; but these possibilities only become realities in so far as he imitates those who have been before him. The first utterance of the child on the mother's bosom is but the lisping imitation of the mother's words. If this then is the origin of speech, what objection can there be advanced against the idea that good public speaking is also an acquirement of successfully imitating nature? Admitting this we must also hold that oratory is an art, since art in its very essence is an imitation of nature, and consequently founded on the science of nature. In this way science is made useful, in serving as a foundation to some beneficent art. All the various expressions of the true, the beautiful and the good in nature would be meaningless, unless they serve as means by which man's nobler faculties are called into activity.

Art is usually divided into elegant and useful arts. The elegant arts are those which are more especially directed to man's æsthetical nature, while the useful arts require our

* Quintillian's Institutes, B. II., Ch. XVI.

† Art de Parler, B. V., Ch. I.

hands more particularly, and also minister to our wants more especially. Taking this division of art, it is rather difficult to say to which of these two divisions oratory belongs. It must belong to the elegant arts, since it is in part addressed to the imagination. But with this address it not only seeks to please, but it also draws attention, and finds an avenue to the passions, in which it is enabled to subdue the most stubborn resolutions. Consequently it is also a useful art, since it teaches us how to use our speech to the best advantage. For if logic is useful in marshalling our thoughts into an argument, oratory is useful in taking command of that argument against the contesting forces, and thus winning the day.

But while we say that oratory is an art which is to be studied, we must also hold that it has a moral element. Art considered by itself has, indeed, a strong power, but it has not that strong moulding power, which is required in oratory. An empty mill-dam is not sufficient to run a mill; neither is an empty declamation sufficient to transform a mere man into an orator. These channels, though necessary for the work, are useless in themselves, unless they are filled with some motive power. The orator has not merely to communicate his ideas, but also his feelings, passions, dispositions and purposes, which presupposes that the speaker is in possession of all these; for, how could he communicate them if he did not have them? For this reason truth and right must be on the orator's side, as oratory is in its character positive. It is possible, indeed for a speaker to assume for a time a moral air, and thus disguise his hypocrisies; but his display, be it ever so brilliant, is only like the lightning from the distant horizon on a warm mid-summer's eve—a flash and it is gone. This shows that there is a very strong ethical element in oratory. The artificial is needed in it, but it also requires that the orator be a good man. This is the result at which most writers, on the subject, have arrived. The triumph of Demosthenes over his rival Eschines (who was, without doubt, the more cultivated man) is generally attributed to the moral weight of Demosthenes' char-

acter. The orator's aim is not only to accomplish some end, but some beneficent end. And to the accomplishment of this end, it is his duty to use all legitimate means, which art and character can furnish him. Hence we may define oratory as being *that power in a speaker by which he adapts his discourse to some beneficent result.*

THE NATURAL PROCESS OF ATTAINING THIS RESULT.

Whatever the purpose of an orator may be in addressing a public assembly, his final aim is not merely to convince his hearers of the truth of what he says, but to move them into action. This activity, according to natural laws, is preceded (1) by an assent of the understanding, and (2) by a consent of the will. Hence the ultimate faculty, which the orator has to touch, is the will; and, if it can be shown by what psychological process the will may be influenced, then the natural process by which the orator attains to his results is also pointed out.

Man is endowed with the faculties of understanding and will; and with these are coupled all the varieties of human passion. The understanding is the nearer related to the external world, as is proved by experience. To make an impression on any mind it is necessary that that mind be brought into a state of acquiescence, or neutrality. However, in such a condition the mind is not able to abide long; but the hidden spark of passion will be formed, and the mind will soon be in flame. This will force the will into a decision; and so we find that the avenues by which the will is reached, are respectively, the understanding and the passions. This is essentially the view of Archbishop Whately, which he so successfully maintains in his "Elements of Rhetoric."*

Thus it follows that oratory demands reasoning to obtain an assent of the understanding, and a play of fancy to kindle the fires of passion with which to burn the antagonistic principles

* Part I., Ch. I.

of the will, and so leave it purely under the control of the orator. The orator is not satisfied when he is eagerly heard, when he is admired for his florid language, or when he is praised for his profound thoughts. He demands still more from his hearers. They are to be moved into the same thoughts with him, to hold an idea as true or false as he does, to hope or fear as he does, in brief, the audience is to do as he desires them to do, and without this power in the orator, wisdom itself will lose its lustre. In this comprehensive sense, oratory takes possession of all the faculties of man. It is the result of the grand action of various complicated powers. "It is one child of the prolific mother of many arts, which have a common principle and character of perfection, and which never fail to help each other."

It is useless, at this point, to advert to the fact that oratory has not only swayed individuals, but whole empires have been captivated by its charms. From the earliest dawn of history it was considered essential to every statesman and hero that he should be an orator. For this reason Moses, when he was met by God at Horeb, and ordered to go into Egypt to lead the children of Israel from the land of bondage, replied, as the last excuse to his reluctance: "O my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant; but I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue." This seems to be the first time that oratory, or eloquence is spoken of, in connection with religious matters. It is true, that although Moses did not possess the power of oratory, he still became a mighty power in the hands of God. But who would venture to deny that if Moses had the gift of speech in a more eminent degree, he would have become still a greater power in the hands of God? Take the most prominent prophets, what were they but orators; take the preachers of Christianity that shine with the most brilliant lustre in the annals of church history, what were they but trained orators? Look at a Chrysostom, Ambrose, Massillon, Whitefield, Wesley, and hosts of others. Their lives give a lasting testimony to the utility of oratory in preaching.

For a moment let us now consider what class of public speakers have the best opportunities to become good orators ; for it is an indisputable fact that the inspiration of the orator depends largely upon the circumstances in which he is placed. Considering then the circumstances in which both the secular and the sacred orators are placed, it is easy to decide which of them is capable of the higher oratorical development. The secular orator has to speak merely from a temporary excitement, while the sacred orator is stimulated by the eternal interests which may depend on his speaking—life or death. From this it is apparent that the sacred minister has the advantage in this respect. The position in which he is placed, is enough to inspire him to noble achievements ; standing, as he does, with the bright light of Heaven above him, the doleful realm of Hell beneath him, and a congregation, which he is to mould for eternity, before him. Adding to his position the unparalleled theme, which he is to handle—a theme occupying the mind of the most exalted seraph—who can remain mute ?

This brings us to consider the *function* of oratory in preaching.

As long as it is impossible to preach in a kind of magical way, by transmitting our thoughts to others in a mesmeric state—by putting them asleep instead of rousing them ; so long are we unjustified in neglecting oratory in preaching. For as long as we are in our physical organization, the spread of the gospel and its root-taking power, depends largely upon the way in which the truths are proclaimed.

The first thing to be considered in regard to the Christian minister is, that he is a messenger of God ; and, as such, he has to deal with the grandest and sublimest truths, which the human mind is able of comprehending. But he is not only to deal with them, he is also to believe them. And from the nature of the case his ministry is bright or dim in proportion as his faith in the Divine Revelation, which he is proclaiming, grows stronger or weaker. He must feel the solemn realities of life and the awful destiny depending upon it. The Revelation,

which he is announcing, is to form the warp and woof of his own nature—yea, it is so to pervade his very being that it gives direction to all his actions.

The next thing to be considered in the preacher is, that he *ought* to make use of those faculties with which God has endowed him. For of what use is it to entrust a man with the truths of Divine Revelation, unless he uses all his power to kindle in the cold and selfish breast of mortals the fires of an undying religion? The word of God is indeed “quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword,” but unless it is committed to a person with a kindred spirit, it loses much of its penetrating influences upon the human mind. The truths of Divine Revelation are spiritual and have no visible form, except so far as they are manifested in physical activity. And to produce this manifestation of the truth, the preacher should muster all his energies—spiritual, intellectual, and physical; so that he may give to the truths such visible shape as shall make them both attractive and effectual. Or, in other words, the preacher is to adjust the different truths, which he is to make known, so that they shall be productive of their desired result, when rightly applied. It is, however, more to the *application* of those adjusted truths, than to the adjustment itself, that our attention is directed in this discussion. But in order to understand what the best method of application is, it is necessary to understand the nature of that which is to be applied.

The truth which the preacher is to enforce is religion, or rather the religion of Jesus Christ. Something, which in its essence, belongs to the heart. It is not an intellectual belief, nor is it of such a nature that it can be demonstrated like a theorem in Euclid. It takes hold of a person's character; because the first thing in this religion is the transformation. “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” Man must begin life in a new sphere, which may be said to resolve itself, so far as man is concerned, into the change of the supreme choice of self to that of God and one's neighbor, as the supreme objects of service. Taking this to be

the correct view of the case, it follows that the will is the ultimate faculty concerned in man's religious nature. And to reach this, as we have seen, is just what oratory aims at. What, then, can be more advantageously employed in winning men to Christ, than sacred oratory, since it so naturally corresponds to the idea of revealed religion, as the eye does to the light?

Devotional feelings and a sincere purpose of doing good, united with intellectual culture, are not sufficient to make a true preacher—they are potent inspirers, but they are not always the basis of his success. It is not sufficient to present the truths of religion in such a way that it only makes the understanding acquiesce in its claims. Its purpose is accomplished in the change of the will. And to this end the powers of oratory are to be called into requisition. Christ said to His disciples "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves! Be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves." They were to apply the shrewdness of the serpent to their preaching; thus showing that barren words are not always sufficient to lead men from "darkness into his marvelous light."

If the views, which have been presented, are correct, then of what infinite importance is oratory in preaching! With what discipline of voice, gesture and general expression ought the preacher to proclaim the truth of the Gospel!

The importance of oratory in preaching is also seen in the fact that it makes worship attractive as well as useful. In all the ages of the world, human nature has endeavored to make worship attractive by some art. The Jews had their splendid temple and sweet music. Christianity, unable to escape from this fundamental impulse of our nature, began to build cathedrals, and magnificently adorned them. Thus the grand arts of painting, sculpture and architecture were called forth. Man has an æsthetical nature, and its wants demand satisfaction in worship as well as in every thing else. History also informs us that the different arts of an age will be according to the æsthetical taste of that age. If the taste of an age is materialized, its arts will also assume a more tangible form; but as the

taste becomes more refined, the arts assume a more metaphysical character. Thus, for example, the Middle Ages were destitute of real oratory, because the mind had to find expression in a physical form, as sculpture, architecture, &c.; but as the mind emancipated itself from the thralldom of ignorance and superstition, and so became the recipient of grander and sublimer truths, the finer arts, such as oratory and music, advanced in like proportion. These, the real stamping of one soul upon another, will always be a criterion, by which the advancement of an age may be judged. Books may be multiplied ever so much, yet oratory will have a necessary existence. Men must be roused to noble and magnanimous actions, which is impossible through mere reading. It is this which gives to oratory its permanent character. But it is not in this only that we find its importance; for, who does not feel the higher spiritual influence of genuine oratory? Its influence as an art is far more spiritual than that of any other art. Why not then make the worship and service of God more attractive by this art, which in its essence is spiritual, (and so corresponds to the idea of religion)?

In view of these facts, should the church not be more awake to its interests in the way of presenting opportunities to acquire a graceful oratory? Would it not well repay the efforts, if a course of oratory would find a place in the curriculum of seminary instruction? It is true that God must give the increase, though Paul plants, and Apollos waters; but is it not equally true, that the more is planted and watered, the more God can make to increase?

ART. VI.—THE PLENARY INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.*

BY REV. A. H. KREMER, D.D.

THE question which it is proposed to consider in this article is not: are the several books of the Bible authentic and genuine—were its thirty or more authors,—living in different ages—localities—widely diverse in vocation, culture, and mental endowments, under the superintending guidance of the divine Spirit, *in the main*, but what is the measure, and the true nature of the Spirit's agency, in giving to the world a revelation of God's will, as contained in what Christians designate as "*the Book*," extending from Genesis to Revelation?—Is the *Bible* the word of God *exclusively*, written indeed by men, but given word for word—every "jot and tittle," as the inspired utterances of the Holy Ghost? Thus we hold and affirm. In the plenary inspiration of every word of the sacred volume lies, we firmly believe, its only safety against the attacks of infidelity and a refined and subtle rationalism that is insidiously seeking to undermine the foundations of divine revelation, and which has enlisted the best piety and learning of the friends of our holy religion, in exposing this specious foe.

The statement that the Holy Ghost preserved its writers only from "material error"—that its historical portions were "left largely to human judgment," has seriously affected the divine character of the sacred volume as a whole, and given strength to skepticism and unbelief. "If," says one of the most eminent biblical scholars of the old world, "I thought so meanly of the word of God, as is the fashion now to think of it by some in high places, and who profess to honor it, I should feel as if the sun had been blotted out of the heavens, and that life had lost

* The attention of the reader is directed to Gausson and Garbett, to whose able works on plenary inspiration this article is largely indebted.—A. H. K.

its best ornament. * * * Whenever it is the fashion to think meanly of Inspiration, it also becomes the fashion to call in question the doctrine of a particular Providence. And yet, the loftiest doctrine of inspiration no more reduces inspired men to the level of mere mechanical agents, than the entire belief in a particular Providence can be thought to result in the doctrine of irresistible fate or blind necessity. * * There is then no *logical* alternative between utter unbelief in any Providence at all, and belief in a particular Providence, which extends to the minutest details of life. Nor can there be any possible *locus standi* between the rejection of Inspiration altogether, and a hearty belief that the words of Scripture are every whit as much inspired as the sentences which they make up; the syllables as the words."

This clear and emphatic utterance is fully sustained by our blessed Lord, whose "name is called the Word of God." Pointing to the Father's care for the sparrow and the "numbered" hairs, as illustrative of His special Providence, He points in the same connection, to the unfailing character of every "jot and tittle" of His infallible word—*infallible* because divinely determined in its every detail. How different this the judgment of Him in whom are "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," from those wise men (?), who admit of at least "a few errors," or remove from the sphere of inspiration, "a very few statements purely historical, minute and isolated, absolutely unconnected with religion and morals, because of the *human* element. But does the human element necessarily involve human errors? Is there *any* part of the Bible absolutely infallible? This none but an infidel will deny. And, why infallible?—because "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Is *any* portion of the sacred writings given in the *chosen words* of God? This is admitted even by a Colenso. The same holds, we maintain, with regard to *all* the words of those divine oracles; they are all given under the special supervision of His infinite wisdom. What is the Bible? Is it not a written revelation of God to man? Are not its teach-

ings in strictest harmony with His infinite perfections? Not only are its contents directly from God, but the form also, in which those contents are given in every word and syllable, in every name and numeral. An able writer on this subject has forcibly said: "That any chance verse in the Book of Chronicles, containing a few names which neither impress the memory, nor affect the imagination, should strike a man as uninspired, I can well conceive; because I can well understand that a dry leaf in autumn spinning in the gale and dropping unheeded at his feet, may beguile into a vague notion that of course God takes no note of *that*. But we all know better. We know that not a sparrow falls to the ground without God; and if not a sparrow, then not a plume of a sparrow's wing; if not a plume of its wing, then not an atom of down upon its plume. And so, I repeat, it is with the words of Scripture. The words no less than the sentences; the syllables no less than the words, are the work of Inspiration. Convince me that just one thing has ever happened in the world by chance; show me that accident has any place whatever, the very least, in nature; show me that in reckoning the hairs of my head, my Maker has overlooked *just one*, and I will teach to-morrow that Scripture is a fallible record; that the words of Scripture are exclusively human, and not at all divine."

This view of the Bible is, we think, fully sustained from the nature of its all-pervading substance and life. It is a complete and harmonious organism; the very embodiment of the infinite and perfect Christ. As in the incarnation, the human is perfect in its union with the divine; without the slightest defect or blemish, so is the Bible in which the divine Logos lives, perfect. The revelation is as perfect as the Christ revealed from its beginning to its end, in its historical as well as ethical aspect. All constitute a complete whole, the word, the writing of God. He planned it, He carried it out, in every minute detail, by nearly forty workmen, of different capacities indeed, but doing His work as he willed. In this lies the infallible verity of the Bible. How could it be otherwise? How but by

the right use of words could the mind of God be communicated; and how could weak and erring man make such use, unless divinely directed?

Not that inspiration made all the words, or communicated facts already known, or did violence to the peculiar habits or culture of the writer, but so directed his every word as to write *how* as well as *what* God in His infinite wisdom and goodness would reveal to man. Is it not written? "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me and his word was in my tongue." This holds with regard to every word of the Bible, whether historical, doctrinal or prophetic—nothing, not one iota is given in "the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." God has not only given us the facts of revealed truth, but the terms, which to His infinite mind seemed best adapted to convey to us a knowledge of His will, and his purposes of mercy. How, we know not, any more than we know how the divine Word became incarnate, or how the depraved soul of man is regenerated, or how "God worketh in him both to will and to do of His good pleasure." We know that this is God's work, just as we know that all Scripture is given by the Spirit of God. There is a sense, indeed, in which all the words of the Bible are the words of man, for human tongues have spoken them, but it is true in a still higher sense that they are the words of God, He speaking in and by man, or even in a few instances through some other creature agency. Did not *God* speak to the impious king of Babylon, from his palace walls, and to Balaam with the tongue of an ass, and in a style by no means alike? Yet verbal inspiration is denied upon the ground of differences of thought and modes of expression, found in the several writers of the sacred Scriptures. Bad, as well as good men have spoken part of the divine oracles. Caiaphas, burning with intensest hate against the Son of God, uttered, in his unconscious prediction, the very words of God, as really as the pleading words of our suffering Lord: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The Holy Ghost in His operations is not conditioned by human peculiarities or specific men-

tal endowments. He speaks as really and as verbally through the child Samuel, as He does through the matured and profoundly learned Paul. Foul fiends from hell spake His words in every syllable and letter: "Jesus, thou Son of God, what have we to do with thee?" as truly as did holy John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." It is important then to notice that while holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, wicked men and devils, nay even a brute, spake the words of God, as recorded in the divine Scriptures. The Bible is from first to last a complete and unerring revelation from God. It bears the message of eternal life to the believer; it is to him the voice of the Lord in every sentence and word, whatever might be the character or the individual peculiarities of the speakers or writers. Hence the distinction will clearly hold that writers of the holy Scriptures were not always inspired, but the Scriptures themselves were. The measure of human inspiration, therefore, is not an object of faith, but that the Scripture itself is the inspired word of God, in every "jot and tittle," we are bound to believe.

All true Christians have a partial inspiration. The Spirit reveals to them the "deep things of God," so that they can teach and enlighten the world in spiritual verities, but their words are not the unerring words of God. Their's is not the inspiration of David when he said: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue."

All the writers through whom God communicated His will to man, all who spake or wrote the sacred Scriptures, uttered the words of God, whether they were ignorant or learned men, whether or not they understood the import of their utterances. "Let it be well understood," says an able writer, "that the sacred writings are *all that is written*, and that it is the sentences and the words which are divinely inspired. The question is, therefore, as to the *word*, and not to the men who wrote it. With regard to these latter we are little concerned. The Spirit may have more or less associated their individuality, conscience,

recollections and affections, with what He caused them to say: it is not material that we should know this; but we are called upon especially to know that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. * * It matters little to us as far as faith is concerned to know what was passing in the minds of the sacred writers (or what their mental or moral status), when engaged in writing their respective parts of the Book of books. Our attention should be rather turned to the *words* which they have written, because we know that these words are from God. Let the prophet be as holy as Moses, wise as Daniel—an enemy to God as Caiaphas, polluted as Balaam, I may say, insensible as the hand upon the palace wall at Babylon, formless, soulless as was the air through which sounded the voice of God at Sinai,—on the banks of the Jordan, and on Mt. Tabor, we repeat all are of little consequence, except where the personality of the writer might become an essential part of His revelation. Thy thoughts, O my God, Thy mind and Thy words are what concern me!"

The references of Christ and His holy Apostles to the sacred Scriptures, are proof of their verbal inspiration. Follow Him who asserts Himself to be "the way, the truth and the life," through the whole of His eventful ministry—note the character of His teaching, and you have a living commentary, an indisputable insignia, attesting the plenary inspiration of the Old Testament writings. He quotes and expounds "all the law, the Psalms and the prophets," from Genesis to Malachi, without the recognition of one omission or mistake, in phrase or word. "*It is written,*" is the emphasis of His every reference to the sacred Scriptures—"written," not by the will or judgment of man, but by the wisdom and will of God, in every part, as truly and literally as the decalogue, written on two tables of stone. He knew the Father, the infinite author of the Scriptures, for He came from the Father. He knew those Scriptures as God's letter to man, God's in every line and syllable. Had there been in it a single error or interpolation of man, He would have exposed it, as He did the

traditions of the Elders. If in all the Scriptures there were a license for human fervor, apart from a divine and verbal inspiration, such room we might suppose in the Psalms of David, yet our Lord declares that He "*wrote by the Spirit*," and Christ in quoting him, or any part of the sacred oracles, asserts in those quotations the very mind of the infinite Father: "*It is written*," not as the word of man, but as the word of God. The whole divine record, from first to last, stood in His infinite mind with unerring clearness. He knew the absolute plenitude of its inspiration, or He had never said: "It is easier for heaven or earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail." He who saw the absolute perfection of creative power and wisdom in the *lily*, surely saw no less perfection in the Book divine, which testified of Him who was eternally in the bosom of its unerring author. However men may presume to speak of some portions of the Bible as left to the "free choice" and "intelligence" of its writers, Christ, the infinite Christ, did not. He saw and asserted the complete inspiration of every word and particle of God's revelation to man. The holy apostles, whom Christ commissioned to teach men "all things whatsoever He commanded them," bear a like testimony to the entire inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. They do not only speak of what the "*Holy Ghost said*," and what "*God said by such a prophet*," but they emphasize *single words*, and draw from them and enforce the most important truths, as for example the word "*all*" in Heb. 2: 8—the word "*once*," in Heb. 12: 27. Our limits will not permit an extended reference to the many instances furnished in the apostolic writers, proving beyond all successful controversy, their faith in the inspiration of every expression of the Old Testament Scriptures. They were assured that their divine Master so viewed them. Hence the solemn and emphatic annunciation: "If any man shall add unto, or take away from the words of the Book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life." Such use and solemn sanction of the sacred Scriptures can accord only with their being the word of God, not in their gen-

eral sense only, but in their words as well. "If selected under the guidance of the perfect wisdom of the Omniscient Being, to whose infinite grasp all times, all persons, all events, are present at one and the same time in the eternal *now* of His own existence, then they are full of God, and must have a depth and reach of meaning, a profound force and significance, a faultless and unerring appropriateness, that invest each single word with the full authority of the Deity. The question in such a case is not what the human writers meant to say, but what "*the Spirit that was in them did signify.*" Such verbal inspiration of every part of the sacred Scriptures," would not only "give them more sanctity and authority," but it would give them *all* authority; and the statement of some divines that "even if we could determine with complete certainty their original reading in every case, the mass of the Christian world who read the Scriptures in translations, would not be profited by verbal inspiration," does, we think, a serious wrong to the true character and significance of the holy Scriptures. Admitting some defects in the translations from the original, or some omissions, and even interpolations in the transcribing, is it not of infinite moment to have had a true and perfect original text? Would not competent and faithful translators of the *decalogue*, written with the very finger of God, give us more nearly the mind of God than if it were not verbally inspired? How then can it be truthfully said that there is no profit to the general reader, even were the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures "with complete certainty determined," because of defects in translation? Would defects in a superstructure make of "no profit" the perfection and faultless character of its foundation? Might not this be its only security against disaster? *Taking* the Bible then, in its varied fortunes through the ages of its history, the wonderful protecting Providence against the most determined purposes for its utter annihilation, our only secure ground is this: that holy men, from Moses to the apostle John, spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, God thus communicating His will to man, "during a period of near-

ly 1600 years, employing priests and kings, warriors, shepherds, publicans, fishermen, scribes, and tent-makers, associating with the word in a mysterious manner, and according to His own wisdom, their affections and faculties, so that the Bible is, from its first line to its last, the work of the same all-wise author. Whatever the sacred penmen may have been, whatever their circumstances, their impressions, their comprehension of what they wrote, and the measure of their individuality, brought into operation by this divine and mysterious power, they have all, with a faithful and directed hand, written in the same volume, under the guidance of the same Master, in whose estimation 'a thousand years are as one day,' and the result is the Bible." Hence, God, in giving to the world a written revelation, gave it through men, but wisely selected, for His work, and which He superintended with infinite wisdom and care, as would a master-builder select skilled and approved artisans, in the erection of an edifice, with this difference, that the latter is finite and erring, even in the highest possible attainment of his art, whilst the former is infinite and unerring. We have, therefore, in the Bible, "a complete history, and a complete system of truth, to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be taken away," any more than we can take away anything from a living organism, without impairing its individuality.

The objection that minor details—things of seemingly little importance, do not accord with the high dignity of divine inspiration, is without logical force. Relatively, we have in every domain of the vast universe the great and the small. Is it then a wrong to the divine Omniscience to hold that He presides over the least thing in His own creation, however small or unimportant to human view? Does He not "comprehend the dust of the earth in a measure" as well as "weigh mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?" Just as a single drop is an essential part of the great ocean of waters, so is every "jot and tittle" of the sacred Scriptures to the unity and completeness of the whole. Against this unity and com-

pleteness, the human element in the Scriptures is no argument, for this is under as complete control of the divine, as was the hand on the palace wall. Hence the Bible is both the plenary and verbal inspiration of God; "plenary inasmuch as God's attributes, wisdom and perfect truth, have found expression through it; verbal, because the vehicle of its expression is as it could only be in communication to mankind—the vehicle of words."

We know the view of the divine Scriptures taken in this paper, is in conflict with the whole school of rationalists, from the baldest to the most subtle and refined—from the cold and crude Strauss, to the more amiable Priestly. These call into requisition philology, science, and reason, to fathom the "deep things of God," and assay to turn into a lie the declaration that all Scripture is by the inspiration of God and that holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But to the truly spiritual mind, enlightened and sanctified, by the divine Spirit, with the will and the affections subordinated to Him who "spake from heaven," there is a consciousness that He "spake all these words," that the Bible is "the law of God's mouth," that every word has a power divine, a certain indescribable tone and spirit, unknown to the most lofty utterances of uninspired man—absolutely unmixed with error, because it is "the word of God," and "which will live and abide forever."

ART. VII. - SPIRITUAL DYNAMICS.

BY REV. ALLEN TRAVER, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

THERE is a broad line of demarkation between the form and substance of any created existence. The distinction between life and the material form in which it dwells is most obvious and marked. The surface presented to the eye and the touch is quite unlike the living forces. The spring of life is distinct from the outward manifestation of it, and the love and the life of the spirit and the imperfect expression thereof in rude forms of crude and unrefined matter, cannot be confounded with safety by any one who would attain truth and nurture his soul with its vital substance. In the use of language, in literature and conversation, correctness, purity, power and brilliant antithesis are only the beautiful garbs and golden settings essential in a measure and ornamental, yet formal qualities of mental expressions flowing from the soul; while the substance is thought, truth and living principle, and the soul, the thinker, is the vital and creative agent. There are those who are lovers of nature, and present for our consideration vivid and beautiful representations of the many-colored hues that compose the brilliant and ever-varying surface of things. There are others who look through the externals of objects for the secret and mysterious principles of being, thought and action. Another class consider mind in the abstract, its nature, properties, manifestations and modes of life. Its destiny is a frequent theme of thought, conversation and discussion. They look at material objects chiefly as the visible expression of the existence, character and will of the Supreme, sublime and unseen intelligence whose presence informs and sustains the universe.

In all that pertains to man, he goes below the stillness of the surface, and watches the force of the under-currents, the efficient springs and principles of action. He does not simply view the revolving wheel turned by the perpetual stream, but examines the fountain and gauges its capacity for all the varied purposes of life and being. The nature of the vital agent becomes the subject of inquiry.

There is a science which we may call *Spiritual Dynamics*. Man is a soul, a spirit, destined to eternal existence. He is a spiritual force or agent. He exhibits spiritual activity from the earliest years of his being. He has a spiritual disposition, that is, either a tendency to good or evil, and he follows this with avidity. He has spiritual desires, or aspirations and longings, for unrealized attainments. Truth ministers to these aspirations and longings, and leads it by its subtle lines to God, the Supreme Good, and to Christ, the pattern. The soul is satisfied in proportion as it receives, and assimilates and obeys spiritual truth, and becomes Christ-like and is moulded to the image of Him who gives us truth that we may be free.

1st. The thinking, reasoning and motive-power of man is spiritual.

When man's nature and activity and destiny, and his relations to the Infinite and the future become the subject of consideration, it is found that there are two radically distinct views advocated, and only two. The advocates of one avow it as their conviction that man is a being superior only in degree to the animals by which he is surrounded and over which he exercises a mastery and control, and that we are intended, like beasts, birds and insects, for a transient and a brief existence, which terminates with the dissolution of the body, and that that which is called the soul is dispersed and scattered, and ceases to exist, like the odor of a flower that is crushed. And the inference to be derived from this is legitimate and near at hand, which is, that the only rational employment is to devote it to present enjoyment. This opinion has been sanctioned and advocated by quite a large number of the race, in all ages

and in all countries, and especially in times of great corruption and of sore calamity. Previous to and during the French revolution it prevailed with alarming force, and it increased with the whirlwind of passion and fury which raged in France till she was drenched in blood and its boldest advocates were swept from the earth in the revolutionary rage and butchery of those times. It also preceded the fall of the Roman empire, and after the close of desolating wars we note that it had then reached its high-water mark. For a time, it is avowed in all its horrid deformity. It spreads as rapidly as a conflagration when the wind and the tempest favor it, in communities where vice and crime and lecherous debauchery has prepared and paved the way. After its breath has outraged humanity and made angels weep, and its work of destruction and desolation has been wrought, it is rejected with loathing, gives way before the power of moral, intellectual and spiritual truth, and, as the reaction becomes somewhat general, it is viewed with utter horror, and those who once advocated it, or tacitly consented to its uttered maxims, look on it as a system that was "built in the eclipse and rigid with curses dark."

As a philosophical theory, it is repugnant to the common sense of mankind and the noblest and best instincts and feelings of our nature. To argue that man is merely an animal of a higher grade than that which he subdues and tames and uses; that he has only been ennobled and gradually disciplined into reason, and exalted to the experience of a wide range of consciousness and to the light of reason and conscience under which his will moves and decides; and that, therefore, the history of civilization is the history of the development and growth of baboons or creatures akin to them, is not only repudiating the idea of human perfectibility, but indicates the sure and speedy return to the life of apes and monkeys, when the corrupt element becomes the working power of man, which it does from time to time.

Where would there be hope for, and where would we find real progress, growth and constant advancement in all the

moral, intellectual, spiritual and social virtues and graces of life and civilized society, if these views were logically carried out and persistently advocated through all ranks and grades and avenues of national, political, civil and social, religious and intellectual life? It would vanish, and we, as Christian nations, would retrograde and return to the wilderness of the untutored savage.

The second view of our nature, higher and holier, and claiming more dignity than the one to which I have alluded, is that of the spirituality of man's personal being, as a soul, and that it is connected by strong temporary ties of the body and of the senses with the material and the sensual world, yet belonging to one and intended for one essentially higher. That man is a spirit we regard as a primitive truth. I regard it as an original intuition, and that He who formed our nature not only planted the soul in the body, but this belief. Spiritualism, whether founded on the teachings of reason, innate and intuitional convictions, or the faith which rests on written revelation, is that the soul is a substance not cognizable by the senses, and which does not reveal its naked existence to the senses only through phenomenon, and which, therefore, is called spirit. This view, based on the consciousness and other primitive and intuitional truths, holds equally of the ideas of God, the spiritual nature of the race, and external nature—the entire universe—and without confounding them and without isolating them, or denying their relation to each other.

There can be no well-founded objection to the views usually held of our spiritual nature dwelling in a body, because by means of the senses, we do not recognize its existence or departure.

Even material things exist in an invisible state. Chemists inform us that there is a clear and colorless liquid called nitric acid. If a piece of silver is put into this acid it is rapidly dissolved and vanishes from the sight, and the eye fails to detect its presence. If this solution of silver is mixed with water, no effect whatever is produced. More than fifty dollars may be

dissolved and rendered invisible in a pail of water. Other metals may be treated the same way and with similar results. In short, every visible material can be subjected to certain treatment and thus rendered invisible. When substances are dissolved in water, or are burned in the air, they are not destroyed or lost, but are rendered impalpable and undiscoverable by the senses. By certain well-known appliances they can be recovered and again made visible, some in their elementary state and others in the same state they were in before their invisibility was produced.

"When a bushel of charcoal is burned in a stove, it dissolves in consequence of the gas produced being mixed with the vast atmosphere; but yet the charcoal is still in the air. On the brightest and sunniest day, when every object can be distinctly seen above the horizon, hundreds of tons of charcoal, in an invisible condition, pervade the air. Glass is a beautiful illustration of the transparency of a compound which in truth is nothing but a mixture of the three metals.

The power of matter to change its condition from solid capacity to limpid transparency creates some rather puzzling phenomena. Substances increase in weight without any apparent cause; for instance, a plant goes on increasing in weight a hundred-fold for every atom that is missing from the earth in which it is growing. Now the simple explanation of this is, that the leaves of plants have the power of withdrawing the invisible charcoal and restoring it to its visible state, in some shape or other. The lungs of animals and a smokeless furnace change matter from its visible to its invisible state. The gills of fishes and the leaves of plants reverse this operation, rendering invisible or gaseous matter visible." *

The soul, as we conceive, is an independent spiritual existence, not simply *immaterial*, for this is a negative term, and conveys no clearly defined and positive conception. In human nature there is a power which is not material, but spiritual.

* Piesse.

And this brings us to the last point under this division of our subject, viz.: the phenomena of Memory, as indicating that man is spiritual.

The simple conceptions, the experiences, the reasonings, the gorgeous imaginations, and the fancies crude and dim, yet imperfectly wrought out, the ideals held before the mind, the words, the dates, living events and facts, and principles in literature and all the sciences, that have lived and now live and will in all future time in our memories,—have these made, each one of them, a permanent notch, furrow, or mark of some kind in the brain? Can the record of even a brief human life be registered and held within the compass of a human brain? We are each of us, then, in our thinking being, not merely immaterial, but we are a central, conscious, spiritual life, a soul, whose existence we can demonstrate. We are moreover conscious of our spiritual nature. And this self-consciousness is not identified with our limbs and organs. They are not me, I myself, but they are mine. They are not the power, the force, the will and memory, but they are our instruments. When we use the personal pronoun I, we mean something more than the body.

This spiritual conception of man's nature, in contradistinction to the material one, and which is the basis of all wise and valuable reasoning, and which conducts us to a salutary conclusion, recommends itself with irresistible power to heart and mind and conscience. The wisdom unquestionably found in the Old Testament is confirmed by its teachings on this subject. The sublime faith taught and enforced in the New Testament has this for one of its central points, and the enrapturing hope which it encourages, is that of a future life of love and light and holiness, after man's moral relations have been wisely adjusted, so that no one of the interests of the moral empire of Jehovah may suffer wrong.

The Scriptures teach us that man consists of two parts, body and soul, (Ecclesiastes xii. 7.) The dust returns again to the earth, of which it is a part; the spirit returns to God who gave

it. It is not possible for us to suppress the conviction that there is within the frame of flesh and blood constituting our frail bodies a nature that is spiritual; that the real man is an existence differing from the body, and far superior to it—an enlivening and active spirit, a quickening principle, in which there is the power of sensation, feeling and emotion, and which can think, reason and will, and put the body in motion, and which is far superior in its nature to the body in which it dwells, and from the natural forces that play in the body and through space, and use the paths and circuits of the earth for their race-course.

It is self-evident that man is not mere organized matter, but spirit, and that all the results, the creations of man on earth, proceed from it. He is not mechanical, however much of grand mechanism there may be in his physical organization, but vital with spiritual force and agency in his entire being. He is not vegetable or animal, with the curious and powerful instincts of animals alone; but he has a towering intellect and reason which can reach forth toward the infinite. He is a living soul, created in the image of God, and is likened to his Maker in some respects, but which likeness has been effaced by some moral revolution. And this spiritual and reasoning being is a subject of God. While He created the body from the dust of the earth, He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, or the life of lives, and man became a living soul.

The materialist may urge that we have no sensible knowledge of spirit as we have of natural objects, and hence that there is less evidence of its reality, and that we are left in doubt and uncertainty because we see it not, and that, as we cannot touch and handle it, our ideas thereof are only visionary.

In answer to this position, we reply, 1st, that this accords with our conceptions of what constitutes spirit. It does not appear to the senses. It eludes our search, when with the scalpel or dissecting knife, assisted with the microscope, we seek to penetrate its abode and try to grasp it in its home and downy nest, the brain. It is invisible and insensible to the

senses. Spirit is an entity entirely distinct in its nature from all material substances and from the body in which it dwells. Moreover, we have profound expectations of a future and untried state of retribution.

"Whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?"

The facts and the phenomena of these distinct natures are so numerous and so influential, profound and obvious, that they have not escaped the observation of the race, from the most ignorant savage, whose instincts and imagination shadow forth a dim world in which the impalpable images of the departed dwell, to the philosopher of piercing intellect and with a broad and universal culture.

2d. As man is essentially a spiritual being, endowed with dynamic and static force and spiritual power, we proceed to consider spirit as an active and vital force, with a tendency to development and growth.

The ordinarily recognized theory or principle concerning mind and matter is that spirit is active in its very nature; and that matter is passive. This theory is universal in its compass, and extends to the domains of chemistry. All the particles of matter are as inert as the huge masses which are built up from them. The component atoms of a body do not possess the power of self-motion any further than the body itself does. Every change which takes place from rest to motion, and from motion to rest, is caused by some outward power putting forth force. Atoms have the capacity of receiving, transmitting and modifying these forces. But there is a spirit in man which is far superior in nature to matter, however beautiful it may be in form. This spirit is a power. This power is put forth, and there is an exhibition of positive force. Force manifests itself in action. Every individual action, or every series, is referred by the mind to this force; and this force exists in the spirit, or spirit is power in itself. All original power rests in the bosom of God. Man is endowed with creative life. Evidences of it

are seen in actions and in the creations of his hand; and the centre and the source of this life are in the bosom of the Infinite Being.

All who recognize the Divine existence, agree in the fact that power comes from Him. He gave motion to the planets, and He continues the power of that motion through all its changes and varied phenomena. The varied year is full of God. The forces and the powers and the phenomena of nature are not such in themselves, but they are the diffused expressions of that Being who originated, created and launched the planets in their orbits and gave them their motion and laws. The tides of human life and of all activity in nature are but the ceaselessly beating waves of that divine energy which was poured into our system at the dawn of creation, and it may be is now being poured therein incessantly, and will be while the system continues. We not only were created in the image of God, but, in a limited sense, we are creators, by virtue of the reason and imagination, using the materials the fancy gathers. The world is full of patterns and archetypal ideas, and man observes these, and from materials ready and pliant to his touch, he creates. Original combinations are made, and new forms spring into life and rise up before us, a source of wonder to the entranced spirit.

The soul looks on the created universe and wonders. This wonder, as one of the ancients alleges, is the first cause of philosophy. Then man imitates. Then he repeats from memory the lessons gained in the school of life. Ceasing to imitate and to repeat from memory, he creates, originates new forms, and pours forth the conceptions and the ideas of his soul by the same modes in which the Eternal and the Infinite Spirit designed that he should.

There are three distinct modes of action native to the mind. First, it receives and retains impressions. Nature around us acts on the soul, and the result of this action is that the faculties and powers of it are opened, wants are created and action is put forth. Nature is full of suggestions for the spirit, and

it works most powerfully, as our experience testifies. All her forces are tributary to the work of calling out and creating mature and full conceptions in the soul.

While matter is inactive and moves only as it is moved by some outlying force, spirit cannot but be active. Matter moves as it is propelled by other power than itself. Spirit cannot rest, only as it is chained and held in bonds by the body, and it acts and is vigorous with life even when the body is in chains, and in circumstances from which it cannot break away and soar in its natural freedom and in its native element. One moves not by its own nature; the other rests not in its own absolute nature. The first mode of action constitutes perception and memory.

The second mode of the action of the spiritual nature is that of judging and criticising. Having received certain impressions and facts, and gained certain truths by observation, and treasured them in the memory; holding them in the sight of consciousness, the soul compares, judges, and pronounces an opinion on the subject before it, and which it examines in the light of consciousness.

In order to compare, and judge, and criticise and condemn, and rule out one element and pronounce favorably on another, and receive and use the principle admitted, we must have a perfect mastery of our own minds. There must be the intuitive perception of some truths, that while we may be able to see at times conclusions in the premises, without the logical processes, we can be able to give the most cogent reasons for our conclusions, and to silence objections with stated and formal reasons, or with the simple words of the premises.

We must all learn to think and reason around a subject. We must get rid of what may be only the rubbish, and which is in the way. To separate the essential from the non-essential is important. Then we are to think into it, not merely determinately will and seek to force our way, but enter in with the slow processes of the reason and judgment.

The third process of its action is that of the reason, and ima-

gination and fancy. I use the word reason as representing the power that creates ideals and forms new conceptions. It is a creator, that which originates forms and archetypes and ideals. The imagination is the power by which form is given to the poem, and the picture is wrought on the canvass. The fancy gathers the materials for their appropriate use, "as a child gathers flowers, and the skilful florist arranges them into forms and lines of beauty, after an ideal of his own creation, or as another has furnished it for him.

There are at least two forms of creation wrought out by the reason. There is sentiment and feeling in the soul; and moved by this, its conceptions are originated and embodied in form, and we call it art. Again, it creates with sole reference to the judgment it has formed from a criticism of the materials presented, and we call this science.

Mathematics, and poetry, and all the fine arts, are the creations resulting from the reason, imagination and fancy. All the fine arts and all science is constructed from ideals drawn from nature.

There is still another form of creations of this nature. While the artist and the man of science creates that which serves our daily wants and cleaves to that which is received by universal consent, the bold speculator conceives of that which may be. He approaches the land of shadows and of dreams and that which is an unexplored world. He realizes that along its borders are the decaying and unfragrant remains of departed theories and the ghosts of hypotheses which still haunt the living.

The intellectual speculator examines his ground with care, and draws with precision lines of demarkation between the known and the unknown. He arranges that which is proved and certain on one side, and on the other the unknown, yet, to his mind, the probable. To him there is a charm and a beauty in speculations. He peers into the surrounding darkness, and sets up indices to guide those who follow him as far as they choose, uncertain of his own return, yet entering. With a hero's cou-

rage, he plants himself on the border of the unknown world and a deep unfathomed, and throws a line of speculation across the void that he may find other stars in the spiritual realm. This is not always a harmless pursuit, as the wrecks of faith indicate, though frequently useful. It stimulates inquiry and furnishes to others a guide. And yet hypotheses assist the mind in grouping and holding phenomena.

3d. This spiritual nature has desires, and wants and aspirations. Just as certainly as we have bodily wants, we have spiritual desires and necessities. There is an internal cry for some good which the soul must have, or famish. We are not always conscious of what we need, as the wounded are not aware of the injury they have sustained and of the degree of their danger, but the fact exists, and we will in time realize that there is a call for some spiritual good. We require or need that which will satisfy the call. No material object will do it. The spirit of man cannot find rest or satisfaction in the objects of the material world. Though it has fallen deeply into sin, and lost the correct apprehension of its state, and is not desirous of that which constitutes its highest good, still it longs for something it has not attained. In all ages and in all lands this experience has been recorded.

The soul has certain wants which are not physical, or sensuous, or moral, or intellectual, but which are spiritual. There is a desire native to our being, for a kind and measure of happiness not found in the present, and the earthly or intellectual, but which has affinity for the eternal and the spiritual.

And each individual has peculiar wants, and there is an instinctive longing for that which allays this hunger of the soul. There is an intellectual love for good, which ministers to our nature in a higher sense than the instinctive. There is a spiritual longing and desire for that which will minister to our wants which stretch away toward the Infinite. And without a response to this, we cannot be happy, or pleased, or in any way secure in full measure the ends of our rational and spiritual nature. Hope and fear throb in the soul, as blood beats

and throbs along the veins and arteries of the body. The vital currents question their way through the system from one point of obstruction to another. And thus the soul is agitated with solemn questionings concerning existence, and life and destiny. All men are anxious, because they are sinners and feel guilt. They raise question after question about present realities and future results now unknown. What is dying? where are the dead? what is their condition? What is spirit? and what is the nature of the spiritual state? and what are our relations to the future life? What are the peculiarities of the resurrection body, and state when this occurs? All men stand silent, in mute awe, and hushed are the very breathing of the lungs in the presence of the king of terrors. And this is the testimony of all men who can think. In the presence of the retinue of that unseen monarch, when the spirit of the lowliest and meanest of the sons of men depart, as well as of the princes and potentates of the earth, all feel that they are only men. And no one feels at liberty to deprive any one, whatever may be his religious faith, of the benefit or the consolations of his spiritual adviser. The instructions of religion fall like the dew on Mount Hermon. The heart seeks and turns in search of that which will console it in death. Man wants his highest hopes confirmed, or considerations held out which indicate that they will be realized. He wants his reasonable fears soothed, and quieted and removed, on grounds that are reasonable and convincing to the understanding of the wise. Pain may be endured and pleasure may satisfy for the time, but neither are the basis of a satisfactory peace.

The human soul seems to a close observer a vital principle and essence, which seeks air and light and a higher good, and as an agent which seeks a divine atmosphere, a purer radiance than it receives on earth, and it struggles as does a suffocated flame, and it finds vent in thought and emotion, and in speculations of the pure intellect. Again, it finds relief in creating poetry and in the artistic productions of the painter or statuary; again, in music and architecture. It is a flame seeking

expression through various crevices and fissures, but the vital, central principle is one.

But it must and will act in some form or way. It cannot rest, from its very nature. Hence it gleans one truth after another, and having attained one position it soon seeks another advance stage, as an army that has taken the outworks of a fortress moves on to carry the remainder and secure whatever it may contain. We have glimpses of truth, and this gives us thirst for fuller revelations, and we imagine that there is more than we can see, and the mind is kept in a state of constant play and excitement, and the mind palls. "The past does not interest, the present does not satisfy, the future alone is the object which engages us." Here we find the proof of the wonderful nature of the mind of man, not to say his infinite nature, that we soon undervalue, or abandon for something higher than which we have once thoroughly attained. Hence also we see the wisdom of the Divine teachings in the fact that the grand truths of eternity, and infinity and spirituality, the conception of which it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive, are not fully mapped for us, not given in definite limit and rigid outline; but the clouds above us are opened, and they open around the mountains of truth, and give us gleams and flashes of something supernatural and splendid, but never fully unveil the rich ocean of gold and gems.

God has arranged before us certain agencies, and powers, and influences, which tend to inspire in the soul a desire to seek that which is beyond us, and to hope for attainments which the past has not secured.

He who would secure the object of his creation and life, must not despise or neglect the aspirations that are native to man. And it is a cheerful consideration that when once the mind fully awakes to the consciousness of itself and acquires a correct conception of what life is in relation to God, under Him, and for and through Him; when it feels the powers of the world to come breathing like a wind from heaven on the entire spiritual being, that it stirs all his faculties to fulfil its whole destiny.

What loftiness of purpose is then created ! what strength and zeal ! what energy and consistency of action is evinced in the fulfilment of its bright vision !

“The original desire that draws us to everything is implanted in us by nature ; and this is the desire to return to God as our Fountain. And as the pilgrim who walks on an unknown path considers every cottage which he perceives at a distance as the resting-place, and when he discovers that it is not, directs his hope onward to another, and thus from cottage to cottage, until at length he reaches the harbor, so it is with the soul ; as it enters the yet unknown path of this life, it directs its eye to the object of its highest good, and everything which it perceives to contain any good it takes for it. And as its insight is at first imperfect and has neither experience nor instruction, a little good seems great to it, and hence its desire is at first bent upon it. Thus we see little children vehemently desire an apple, and when they grow larger they desire a bird, and when still larger, a beautiful dress, and afterwards a horse, and then a wife, and then riches, and so on. The reason of this is that the soul does not find in any one of these things what it seeks for and what it hopes to find elsewhere. And thus we may see that one wish always stands behind the other in the eye of the soul, like a pyramid which increases more and more, and spreads towards the basis of all, which is God. In truth, as one loses his path here on the earth, so the soul often loses its way on that path on which our wishes wander. . . .

As we see that he who walks in the right way attains the end, and fulfils his wish, and comes to rest after his labors ; but he who enters the wrong path never attains his object, and never comes to rest ; but he that misses the path can never reach it, but with much disappointment of soul, he will look with a longing eye into an empty distance.”*

When once the soul is fired with aspirations that are heavenward, every energy receives a new impulse and every power attains free and full action. Every feeling is directed to an

* Dante.

object that corresponds with the feeling. The aspirations attain a measure of satisfaction, and man attains his manifest destiny. The soul which attains fellowship with God and becomes one in sympathy with His plan, finds the confusion which once dwelt within and which reigns everywhere in the world, to cease, and cosmos swoons on the bosom of chaos. Peace and purity return to his heart. His powers act with a new and unusual harmony, in one course of duty, and for one great end, which is to know God and dwell eternally in His kingdom, and to be a part of the grand harmony which constitutes His empire. Spiritual good only blesses those who learn to love it. He who would sound vast depths of religious truth; he who would attain a practical knowledge of the relation which he sustains to his Maker, the Infinite, the spiritual, the invisible and eternal, as contrasted with the created, the finite and the material, and the visible and the temporal, must open the eye of the soul, and must cherish an inquiring spirit. He must consider this subject and devote time and attention to it; and he must do it in accordance with the principles which have been discovered and applied in all wise and successful investigation. He must be willing to receive truth however unwelcome, and whatever may be its source.

If the soul is not open; or if it is blinded by the glare of sensible things; or if there is inward, spiritual blindness, as the consequences of sin, and carnality and animality of life and character, and if this becomes a second nature, there is great reason to fear it will never see the world of pure light and true reality and glory, joy, and peace.

As feelings of love, and confidence, and gratitude, and adoring praise, and worship break forth in action, and help form and mould the life, and that from a willing heart, we have the good and pure experience of a truly religious life. The disposition and inclination of the soul must be toward God, the central Sun of the spiritual man. Then our feelings will move and draw us in this direction as our reason does when truth touches and lifts up the intellect. And they will be found

much higher than any of the emotions and affections of a merely natural and intellectual character, or of a moral nature.

4th. This spirit has a definite character and inclination.

We now shall inquire what that is ; whether tending to good or evil ; to virtue or vice.

We are human beings, not angelic. We are human spirits, neither higher or lower than our own order and rank. There are orders and ranks far above us in the scale of beings, as the angelic and the super-angelic. Our nature is human nature. We were created with a nature holy and pure and free from sin. Had the race not fallen and lost its purity and holiness, and lived for the period already passed on the earth, it would not only be a sinless character, but far advanced in attainments, and in knowledge, and goodness and greatness. The progenitors of the race experienced a fall and became sinful beings. Their native holiness not only disappeared, but has been succeeded by a sinful character and disposition. In our personal being there is a perpetual spiritual activity, and as soon as this had fairly begun it took to itself the form of transgression and assumed a definite disposition, and this has grown into character, and it has ripened into fearful evil and the most loathsome fruitage. The character of all free, moral beings is the subject of approbation or condemnation, and under the approval or the condemnation of the conscience, the monitor of right and wrong.

Our spiritual powers, under the prompting of wants, and desires, and aspirations, have put forth in action, as naturally as trees grow and leaves put forth, and blossoms appear, and fruits ripen, and seeds are scattered, the precursor of future growths.

This activity has assumed a definite and settled character, and is disposed to a definite end, growing out of the disposition of the spiritual life, which is itself the centre. The love and the moral tendency of the soul's life, its positive gravitation, is to moral and natural evil, and not spiritual good. By this force the personality now is ruled. This love for evil now constitutes its voluntary choice, its settled state, and the de-

termination of the affections and the entire mind, and soul, and heart. And this must settle the destiny of the individual and of the race, unless another principle is brought in and reverses the life, and character, and disposition, and thus secures a reversion of the destiny. The spirit of man cannot find real and absolute satisfaction and rest in the objects of nature and self, and yet it seeks them with a supreme desire. It is conscious of its sinfulness, and that it has lost the correct apprehension and love of *the supreme good*; yet it seeks not that *Good* which is above all other considerations, but fondly turns to and pursues that which does not satisfy its wants and desires and meet its aspirations. We have capacities and powers for seeking and attaining real life and supreme goodness, and for returning to God from whom we have wandered, but we have not the disposition and love for it, and more than this, we have in the spirit positive aversion for the good to which we are invited. Man lost none of his natural powers by the fall. He has all the single and combined powers, faculties and capacities for affection, and love, and duty, and self-denial, that he had the very day he was created and pronounced good. But they are now perverted and estranged. He has conscience, perception, memory, judgment, reason, imagination, and a fancy wild as a child's unrestrained play. The soul numbers all of its original forces, not one of them is lost; a fallen star man truly is, but the rays are all there, though sinking toward and into endless night.

They are debased and degraded powers. How low and sunken in their love. Once they were powers vigorous with the force and measure of instinct life; now how weak. Were we not fallen beings, and were our intellectual and moral powers and emotions to act harmoniously and in perfect consistency with their original state, we would recognize our dependence on God and our relation to all beings and things which He has created; for we are capable intellectually of recognizing our obligations to Him and acting wisely under our responsibilities.

There is a dim trace of man's original spiritual constitution

by which he does at times feel with the power of a lost instinct, the quiverings of the feeling of dependence. When he reasons on his transitory state he realizes in a measure his utter helplessness. Sometimes he is moved and prompted to the feeling of adoration and to worship God the Infinite. This no one will deny. But this feeling dies, as dies a wave along the shore, and sin rises up and thrills the soul again with new experiences, and involved as he is in sin, he is not disposed to use his powers or consecrate his life to the supreme good in the love and service and adoration of God.

While no one who is in the possession of his reason is destitute of spiritual power, as a simple capacity, he may be blinded by sin, and sense, and the glare of the world, and the glitter of its pageantry, so that he becomes insensible to the reality of spiritual things. In this state, the light that is in him is darkness, and he is ignorant of the fact. He cannot reason truthfully because he is in darkness and ignorant of facts on which correct reasoning is based. You cannot converse with certain persons on the fine arts, or on philosophy, or on the higher truths of religion, without feeling the vitiated atmosphere in your soul in which their intellectual conceptions are formed and wrought out. And when you contrast them with those with whom intellectual, and moral, and religious culture, and æsthetic grace has been made a study, and the fine arts a world in which they could live, and piety the vital function of action, and find evidences of divinity forming the good impulses of the soul, you have been moved to mournful melancholy with the consideration of how much waste there is among God's rational creatures of the finest powers, and the failure to find the purest and best sources of enjoyment in the present and the germs of eternal good. We are grieved and moved with intense spiritual anguish when we see the germs of so much that is fair bear only the coarsest and most unseemly and insipid fruit, and the soul a captive chained in a cell, like the souls in Pluto's cave, with no desire for rays of truth from Heaven's purest and holiest light.

There is the solemn conviction and the deep consciousness that we are in some sense in a state of ruin; that the spirit, sublime in nature, and structure, and imperial in its destiny, is now in ruins. There is the settled faith that it is a nobler nature than was ever wrought into forms of beauty in ancient hall or cathedral. Sin has so ruined man that the spiritual nature does not turn toward God as a needle does to the pole, or the stone, obeying the law of gravitation, falls to the earth, or the smoke ascending into the air. The spiritual power in man has been vitiated by sin; it is weak and under the power of evil; and the soul loves something beside God and His ways with a supreme devotion. There is a failure to maintain a proportionate activity among all the powers in their legitimate rank, because of this universal and fearful schism in the soul. Not only does the spirit fail to turn to God when He calls, as does the flock at the call of the shepherd when they hear his voice, but its power and balance of reason are unsettled, and it is defiled in all its parts; they war with each other through all the eras of their natural life. This is the character and disposition of man as spirit. And that character man can read in the history of the race, which is a most tragic history and career. The individual can read it in his own personal feelings, and passions, and loves and hates.

Let us take into consideration the fact that the soul under the power of sin is not enlarged and enriched. It is not amplified by experience in sin, as it is by experience in good. It may gain vigor for awhile, urged on by the force of the maddened powers, but the range of its action is narrowed in the fact that the higher elements do not come in play. It loses capacity for character of a broad and noble range. Its joy, pleasure and experience, are not of the best grade, and it still suffers from some of the grosser evils of life. Sin has an extinguishing influence on the human soul. There is a hideous destruction of the higher and the grander powers taking place; there is a debasing desolation of the affections, killing out by degrees the faculties and capacities for religion. This reduces the possi-

bilities for good, and the hopes of restoration, up to the last and final period of life.

The religion of Christ comes as a restorer. It puts God above and over man. And man in turn becomes obedient to God. Reconciled and at peace with God, he is soon at peace with himself. His wayward desires and struggles are ruled, under the law of love. Many doubts may arise, and will. The heart will tremble wild and long. But the only clear way to build a character fit for a happy eternity is to find the path of Christ, God and man reconciled in Him; man renewed, and forgiven, and received into the covenant of the family of God, and God's love and wisdom honored by man's reconciliation. Outside of the gospel there is no good news. Involved as we are in sin, there is no deliverance only in the way designated.

There are some stern doctrines in the recorded sayings of Christ, and they are needful as much as are laws and penalties in well ordered states. The point to be attained is the submission of the finite mind of man to the Infinite ways, and will, and wisdom, and love of God. Unless we attain the experience of the full corn in the ear, we shall, when we seek to gather our spiritual forces to grasp death and eternal realities, find ourselves weak, and these truths unreal to us. And the reason will be that they have not been near enough to our hearts. The vital force will be found wanting.

Our eyes, and our life, and our faith and hope must centre in Christ; and we must love and follow Him. Then we must gather up our resources in our own hearts. Then we must be willing to put ourselves in vital relation with our fellow-men. Contact with their spirits will freshen ours. We must seek the strong soul of Christ and His spirit, and be attracted by His magnetism and drawn into His sphere.

5th. The spiritual nature is satisfied and nurtured and attains the end of its being as it gains, and appropriates, and gives out truth, and thus becomes a vital, yet harmonious agent in the moral and intellectual universe.

The most appropriate food for man's soul, as a fallen being,

are the truths of revealed religion. These truths being discovered, they approve themselves to the human reason, and they harmonize with the common sense and convictions of mankind.

We are brought back to our normal rest when we appropriate the food intended for the satisfaction of our spiritual wants. Spiritual satisfaction can only be attained and realized on the condition that the whole inner man be aroused from the centre through all the parts, that it may see that it has departed from the living God. The intellect must be cleared from the darkness of sin. The moral nature must be purified. Though we quench all our natural desires with their natural aliment, the spirit does not find rest or satisfaction in these objects. That which it joins and appropriates while on this lower plane of existence, does not satisfy its aspirations fully; but it stimulates hopes and desires, elevates love, confirms a wavering faith in a measure, and helps to quell and allay our fears and spiritual hunger, and gives valuable assistance that we may fill the measures, and realize the ideals of life.

And the spiritual in man must recognize that there is a spiritual realm, and move toward that realm and seek and enjoy its realities. It must seek to free itself from sin and render its vision pure and unclouded.

All who are endowed with the ordinary powers of mind and their use, have springing up in their nature and welling forth from it, spiritual presentiments and prefigurings; wants and cravings and aspirations. All feel at times obligations and principles and know that they are bound to conform to them.

And that we may all realize the objects which we know are worthy, we must feed on spiritual truth. We must know it in order to love. We must love it in order to learn and know it well. Thus along the path of truth, knowledge, and wisdom, we march steadily and attain those spiritual convictions which steady the soul and brace it, without securing absolute satisfaction. Through these triune forms of experience, truth, knowledge and wisdom, we shall when we enter that kingdom where

are the beautiful mansions and apartments of the blessed, find permanent and satisfactory peace and repose.

It is a sad truth that the world of spiritual experience and knowledge is dark to most minds, because of the glare and confusion produced in the soul by the gaudy and fantastic colors, and the flickering lights of the world of sense, to which the soul has become assimilated. More than this there is a constant and conscious misery and a depraved instinct that leads him to seek enjoyment and diversion of a transient nature and a debasing character, that he may soften his lot.

In order to attain the end of life, we must in imagination be sensitively alive to outward impressions and acquire a degree of acuteness in perceiving the truths of the universe around us and for our good. *b)* We must seek to attain the possession of a plastic power in the soul that we may call into being new and fresh creations. *c)* We must cultivate a fine sense of humanity which enables us to conceive the workings of passion, affection, and emotion, and intellect. *d)* We must embrace the truths of the religion of Christ and be brought into sympathy and positive intimacy with the light and the peace which are the heritage of the good, and we must become co-workers with this good in our daily lives.

As the human body has a relation to all material forms, so the spiritual nature has a relation to all spiritual truth and to the world of spirits. Intellectual, and human, and natural truth, and scientific knowledge, are not adequate alone to the wants of the spirit. Our spirits are connected with an order and a system of existences higher than they are in the scale of being, and than we have seen on earth. There are a number of principles which are central truths and factors for the soul, and which have a spiritual bearing and activity couched under the terms spiritual affinities and powers, and which develop activity in that experience which we call religion and conscience as related to the Infinite, and to the spiritual law of our Maker. These answer on the human side to the spiritual above us, while in the present realm and state of being.

Our real happiness and worth and our highest interests are promoted by a living development of the soul through the activity of these elements in man and in the use of spiritual truth, prayer, and meditation, and praise, and aspiration, and in securing a living and vital harmony between the dictates and convictions of the spirit, enlightened by divine truth and the requirements of the spiritual law of God, as that law is found in the decalogue; as it is interpreted in Christ's sermon on the mount; and as it is responded to in all the chords of the soul which give back a reply, unbroken and untouched by the power of sin. The soul realizes spiritual good by means of spiritual activity, according to the measure of spiritual capacity, satisfied by their legitimate and appropriate aliment.

Man being able from his endowments to look before and after, the soul goes forth in active form, for the purpose of apprehending, and as far as it can, of comprehending that which is spiritual and beyond the reach of sense and the reason.

In the dawn of our being, we are at the bottom of the ladder of life and the scale of intelligence and development, but voices of love and of tenderness call to us, "come up higher," and we hear, and should turn and listen to that call with our spiritual ear and obey.

And when we consider that there is a future, as well as a present, and a past which we cannot undo, we should heed the call. Such is the active nature of the soul, that man cannot confine his thoughts with absolute success to the earth, and with entire slavish blindness cling to the sensible which he knows he must give up. A person who is blind, and born blind, soon apprehends that there is with others the sense of sight, and that he lacks that sense, and consequently is less able to secure the ends of his being. He may learn to make all the proper allowance, and in giving him instruction, you act on the fact that he is thus deficient and he learns to conform to the same principle and fact, with a deep realization of his deficiency. The aspirations of the soul lead him onward from things that are known to those which are unknown, yet within the circle

or reach of human apprehension; from the visible to the invisible, from the temporal to the eternal; from the finite to the infinite. This spiritual activity develops in early years. And when the mind is disposed to serious reflection, it begins to expand and rise above physical and earthly things, and it learns to look out from its new elevation with anxious curiosity, that it may discern the prospects of existence. Having in our childhood been taught the existence of God, we consider anew the grounds of our belief and examine its nature and reasonableness not as a matter of curious speculation, but as the basis of our profoundest hopes and fears. And as we advance in knowledge and consider the cumulative evidence of our responsibility to the Supreme, we find our former instructions confirmed, and we receive the facts of the Divine existence and our moral and spiritual relations to Him. What we once received on authority, we now accept anew on the testimony of the reason. We recognize Him as the benefactor of His creatures; and our dependence on Him; and our responsibility, in view of our free agency and conception of right and wrong; and our disposition toward one or the other; and our deliberate choice thereof; and that supreme devotion is due from the finite creature, to the Infinite Being. As activity and life are fixed watchwords of the soul, and as under their sway, we are directed to seek and find the living and the eternal principles of the universe, the mortal is lifted to the skies. The end and the destiny of man can be reached only as he works out that end in action. And truth is the material of the soul's action, and it becomes its food and nutriment, and the mind learns to love it. Hence we feed the spirit when the mind acts in search of knowledge, and we grow in spiritual stature and attain the end for which we were created.

If reason accords with uttered truth as found in the Scriptures, and the feelings do not, the workings of the feeling and the inclinations must be changed. And that the direction of the nature disposed to evil can be changed, we know from experience. He has given us the power to select our own objects in

life and in a measure to make our own taste. And when our energies seem to demand a sustenance which is evil, or which they cannot secure, when the human will strives for a path we may not follow, we need not starve from inanition, nor stand still in despair, and we have but to seek another nourishment for the mind, which is strong, and nutritive, and better adapted to the soul's highest wants, than the forbidden fruit which it longed to taste. And it may be wise to hew out for the adventurous foot a road as broad as the one we found blocked against us. It requires a price, but all spiritual good is secured by effort and sacrifice. Sometimes we must accept and learn to delight in monotony and quiet, contrary to our nature. But we bide our time and succeed in the end, while we did not love monotony any more than we do pain and darkness. And pain is converted into pleasure and patient endurance, which is necessary to the welfare of a fallen world. But he who cannot endure patiently, rushes onward and reaps shadows and temporal pleasure and secures joy only for a season, but misses the good and brings down on himself evils from which there is no escape.

The Christian conception of life includes man's restoration to more than his normal purity, and entire harmony of the soul with God. It implies more than human superiority in contrast with other forms of life. It includes more than mere human development, growth and culture. Revelation hints of higher, diviner results than our earthly conceptions have hitherto attained. The province and the purpose of revelation is to inform the soul of its state and position in the spiritual universe; and to regulate the mental and moral convictions and instincts and to control the passions and to turn the love of the sensible and the earthly to the love of the spiritual and the heavenly, and to mould aright the affections, and to conduct the soul while in the body toward the supreme good. It is to restrain the tendency of the human mind to cast aside the checks which these convictions throw around it; to render clear to the reason and to reduce to certainty what the soul

may feel, but disbelieves; or what it believes, but against which in the feelings there is aversion, because led away by the power of sin in the soul. We require the help of the Divine artist, to restore and to reconstruct the ruined pile. We require the light to enter that there may be a revelation to our consciousness and that we may be convicted of our sinful state, and led to consider what we are, whence we come, and whither we are going, and what is necessary for our good in the future of an untried existence. Over and above us the heavens bend in beauty and in patience. Spiritual voices call us. And while we hear the call in the soul and recognize the voice of God, the heart should respond, my delight is to do Thy will.

The promises of the Gospel are the soft balm for human suffering. Gilead with its memorable balm will never lose its sweetness. The physician will never fail of His skill. We may murmur the songs of the Lord in a strange land, if we cannot sing them organ-toned. Christianity has come to relieve our sorrow, and is called the religion of sorrow. But it points onward, upward, and heavenward. To dwell with lingering accents on mortal woes and to drain to the dregs the bitter cup of passion, and sense, and sin, and then to turn from the waters of life, or spurn them from our lips, when freely proffered, is equally repugnant to the dictates of reason, and the teachings of our holy religion. Christ's legacy is peace. The voice of complaint does not accord with the music of the heavenly harps. He who is the heir of an immortal hope should lift up his heart in praise, and the children of the heavenly King, with a home in a universe of exquisite beauty and wonder, should not go mourning all their days. And if called to tread the wine-press in sorrow, should still rejoice in assurances of victory, knowing that the day of our redemption draweth nigh, and that the shining ones who were with the ancient ones in the furnace, will not forsake us, and that the day of our redemption draweth nigh. And we should walk while the day lasts in the earnestness of a good life and with cheerfulness of spirit, and meet the divine behests with a strong faith, and not cloud the bright-

ness of the soul with the utterances of persistent grief. Our hearts should be inspired, and under this inspiration they should rise and soar.

Lord Bacon has well remarked that "the harmony of the sciences, that is when each part supports the other, is, and ought to be the true and brief way of confutation and suppression of all the smaller sort of objections; but on the other hand, if you draw out every axiom, like the sticks of a faggot, one by one, you may easily quarrel with them, and bend and break them at your pleasure." And when once we have grasped the grand intellectual conception of the mission of Christ; received and welcomed its renewing and improving truths in our hearts and obeyed them in our lives, then its evidences will not need to be sought for in the reasonings of books, or in historical connections of the various facts of its author's life, but they will be found incorporated into our holiest affections; found absolutely necessary to the renewal, and growth, and development of mankind. In the truths of Christianity there are the facts and principles which are necessary to our earthly and our eternal happiness. In the principles there revealed, we find the key which unlocks the secret of our nature. By means of it, we find the solution of all mental problems. All the contradictions which the natural man meets in the anomalous conditions of life, and all the solemn questions of our restless consciousness can be, in a measure solved and harmony restored to the discordant parts of our moral nature only by means of the truths recorded in the New Testament.

The religion of Christ is like a plant the roots of which strike into the centre of the soul, while the fine and unseen and more subtle fibres, pierce and penetrate into the solidest frame-work of the well-built mind. And its strong and knotty doctrines entangle themselves with the strongest elements of our intellectual nature, as well as with the safest and the purest of our moral and religious feelings. Not only does it touch the interior of the soul where there is the soil of thought, and regulate its disordered action, but it also forms and adjusts in

the outward "relations of life, its innumerable shoots and tendrils. And as there are outer forms, and bulwarks, and scaffoldings, and material relations on which the welfare of all souls are contingent, and if, as no one can doubt, there are innumerable hands and instruments of action by means of which man apprehends and keeps hold of earthly objects, which are necessary to the life and growth of the spirit while in the body, Christianity is their support, and strength, and the spring of life, as well as the ornament of human society, in which the soul finds much of the food which is for its nurture and sustenance.

The religion of Jesus is the vital force in all civilized society, and it is the spring and gives it life-blood. The natural and necessary vitality of the highest forms of civilized life is drawn from this fountain. Christianity has made the tree of our humanity of a splendid form and size, and productive of a luxurious growth of fruit. It employs its husbandry in improving the material, the outer interests of man, but it must necessarily first bestow toil on the hidden foundations and roots. It has worked at the heart with herculean force and corrected much that is evil. Then it has improved man's physical condition. It has given him good clothing, and food, and comfortable homes, and rich thought in the various forms of literature. Again, it has thrown the mantle of beauty over the decayed, and neglected, and corrupted forms and remains of ancient grandeur, and in silence and secret applied the balm of Gilead and called in the good Physician. And when Christianity finds a high form of merely human culture, it throws the garland woven by the Redeemer over it, and imparts of its balm, and myrrh, and healing agents, real life to the vigorous and youthful plant. The holiness of the religion of Jesus mingles with the purely human virtues and sanctifies the man, in the entire sum of his nature. It gives comeliness and grace. Contact of its spirit with man casts an honor and a beauty over the life that was profane and useless. And if this Divine plant, the seed of which was sown by the hand of Jesus, has

served to beautify and to feed us, we in turn owe effort, that we may give to the plant itself some additional energy and power to spread abroad, wide as the circuit of the sun its healing power, its friendly shade, and its twelve manner of fruits, which are for the healing of the nations.

The vitality of holy, educated and cultivated life in the world is not a natural product, but it is the fruit and flower from the fat olive root of the religion of the cross. The husbandry of Christianity is not for the outward and luxurious growth, but for the root of character in the first place. And in the second, it is for the pruning and the culture of the tree and the ripening of the fruit of a holy life, and to hand over to the next generation, the seed that will prove good seed, and sown on good soil will bring forth and mature good, ample and rich harvests. The hidden foundations and roots of man's life have been the first object to which the system of Jesus has paid its respects. Its beneficent influences have then been extended. It has also thrown the mantle of shame around some decayed and neglected and unseemly remnant of ancient grandeur. It has served as a garland for the vigorous and youthful plants of a mere human culture, which have sometimes mingled their fruits with less wholesome products. But it has also given comeliness and grace to the old and the outworn civilizations, and on what was profane and useless, yea a pest and a sore evil. It has cast beauty over deformity. And men may have, by thus partially tilling the old and ruined tree of life, given it additional energy and power to strengthen it for the manifestations of a better life.

And as men are moved by a spiritual hunger and thirst; as they seek and find the requisite food and nutriment; and as they willingly receive this with eager and panting souls and live on the truth, which nurtures the soul, they move toward the centre and the fountain of life, which is God, the pervading Spirit of the universe, the author of sublimity and beauty and the eternal love of truth and right.

God is our hope and our reward in the future, as well as the

author and source of all we enjoy in this world. He can give us greater things than we enjoy here on earth—viz.: a more perfect degree of holiness, a perfected nature, more refined senses, powers wider and grander in their sweep and far more capable of enjoyment than anything we enjoy here. And He can give us objects in the future and unseen which correspond with our powers, capacities and faculties; and adapted to an immortal life.

Religion is the tie that binds man to his Maker. But our nature, and character, and capacities are such, that we need the infinite and the unchanging. We were created for God, not for His works, for these were created for us and are to be used as means to lift us to God, and as the means of the attainment of the highest good. We were created for the eternal, not merely the temporal. It is the visionary dream of a soul disordered by sin, to suppose that the thinking spirit finds the full fruition of its hopes and the realization of its aspirations in the transient and fleeting present. "Love is the nearest approach to the infinite, and for the time deludes men with the thought that it can answer the yearnings of the soul; and why is this but that love is the nearest approach to God, and renders immortality a necessary fact."

The purest and the best joys of earth are blunted and tempered with sadness. The gentler feelings are often wounded. The intenser affections and self-sacrificing love are often struck down by the armed man of sin, and lie wounded on the ground. And this is because man is capable of feelings which life can never satisfy. But in God they have rest and satisfaction. In Him they may centre and find rest and satisfaction. In Him they find Perfect Truth; Perfect Beauty; Perfect Goodness; and Perfect Purity. He is the portion of the soul, and the keeper of all that is worthy, but which may be torn from it in the world. And in Him is all power, and goodness, and wisdom, and the unfailing source from whence the spirit will be supplied during its immortal life and beatific destiny.

The soul at death goes to its account and stands naked be-

fore God. It is shielded by the righteousness of Christ, or it stands with all its blemishes and scars and with aversion to the being and the authority of God. It moves forward in goodness, truth, and beauty and purity, and seeks likeness to Christ, or it is averse to His ways. Every day adds something to the sum of spiritual good or ill. Every falsehood, every oath, every violated Sabbath, every impure act and thought, every day of impenitence, every hour spent in sheer indifference deepens our spiritual evil and darkens our eternal portion. Every good act, feeling, thought and emotion of sorrow for sin and penitence before God, every act of faith, the good wish and the corresponding deed, increases the sum of Good for the world of light. The rich man whether he is a saint or a sinner, carries nothing of his worldly possessions with him. The soul leaves nothing of its garnerings behind. All that is valuable goes across the river of death and abides with it, and is of service in the world of heavenly life and light, love and action, and joy.

All our faculties, and capacities, and elements for emotion and feeling, which enfeebled in their action by disease, and the consequences of sin, will be unfettered by mortal and painful flesh; free from the taint of moral evil; bright with the inherent radiance of heavenly light and lustre; and strong with the indwelling light of the eternal Spirit; and fit for companionship with holy angels, and prepared for deeper communings with the Holy Trinity, and adapted for perfect use and service, and pure enjoyment in the kingdom of heaven.

ART. VIII.—THE REFORMED CHURCH AND POLITICAL LIBERTY.

BY PROF. H. W. SUPER, D.D.

As the domestic relation precedes the political, the earliest condition of society was patriarchal. A prominent individual, with a large family, would acquire a preponderating influence, which would extend itself to others beyond his immediate kindred, and thus he would become the head of a tribe or clan. When a number of tribes would unite or when one tribe would gain a controlling influence over several, the head of the leading tribe would become the head of the whole number. This was the natural condition of society in its secondary stage, when individual independence would give up some of its privileges for the greater security of the remainder.

The primitive condition of man is that of complete political isolation. Each man stands for himself and acts for himself. If two and only two men existed in the first stage of society, each of them would feel at liberty to follow his own will and appropriate to his own use whatever might fall in his way. Nor could either say to the other, this is mine or that is yours. Neither could claim any preference or superiority. Each would stand in the presence of the other as a perfect equal in every claim to the soil or to authority over the animals and fruits of the earth. Each would, however, stand in danger of trespassing upon the soil selected by the other, or claim some product of the earth which the other likewise desired. Both would set up a claim to the whole world, and although neither had any other than what is called a natural right to the soil, each would insist on this natural right as his own. To fortify himself in his position he would insist on subsidiary rights, such as the right of discovery and the right of possession. If no mutual

agreement could be made between them, it might come to a personal conflict and the weaker be compelled to yield to the stronger. The stronger would claim the whole by the right of conquest, and hold all for the use of his posterity or for others on whom he might bestow it. The right of possession, the right of conquest, and the right of discovery it is evident are only set up and insisted upon without any other basis than avarice. The right of conquest is forcible possession, the argument of pirates and highwaymen; the right of discovery is often the result of mere accident, and the right of possession may yield to a previous possessor. The two primitive claimants may, however, meet upon rational ground and agree to mutual concessions. A common understanding may be had between them, and each yield what he imagines to be his private rights to secure a mutual defence. Each yields in one direction to secure himself in another. Both combine to protect each other under the compact they made. Here we have, in its simplest form, the essential element in political government—a compact among men for their common security.

In searching for the best means to carry out such compact the filial feeling in the primitive age would predominate, and some patriarch, venerable in years and renowned for his abilities and exploits, be selected to whom the whole community would cheerfully accord the rank of chief, and commit the common direction of public affairs to his hands. The power once committed to the chief would be carefully guarded by the people and not abused by the holder of it, a common interest binding both to just administration. The possession of this power for years by a single head would lead to its perpetuity in the same family, and hence the claim of inherent sovereignty. If inherent, then it is also transmissible to the descendants of the chief, and hence the claim of hereditary monarchy. The chief, fortified in his position by the possession of power, would gradually strengthen that power and enlarge his claim. The subject would be too weak to contest it, and in a barbarous period, without the means of rapidly spreading

news and securing concert of action, the fresh claim would remain undisputed.

This appears to have been the actual rise of power from the paternal relation in a single family to the patriarchal in the tribe, to the kingly relation in more advanced communities. In the earliest historical times the nations had passed through the first stages and had reached the monarchical form of government. Among the Greeks, according to the poems of Hesiod and Homer, the monarchical form of government is everywhere acknowledged and commanded as the will of God. The king is the right hand of Olympian Jupiter to execute the divine will among men. Among the Israelites the patriarchal government rapidly gave way to the kingly, and a theocratic government maintained for a time, leading finally to a monarchy.

The development of political government thus rapidly sketched would require centuries for its growth. It could not indeed at any time remain stationary. Gradually it would culminate in a claim to divine right. To secure it firmly and without question, it would be based upon the divine will, and all be called to submit to the king as they would submit to God Himself. Gradually also these views would extend to the whole world, and the prevailing mode of government become the monarchical.

When Christianity was first preached by Christ and His apostles, they everywhere came into contact with kingly power, jealous of the least encroachment upon its claims. As Jesus Himself professed to be a king, kings unable to comprehend the distinction between a spiritual and temporal headship, flew to arms, and persecuted to the bitter death the new religion, which might undermine the king upon his throne. If the kings of the earth had understood this religion in its essence, they might well have feared for all arbitrary power based on unjust claims, yet they would have seen that this religion inculcates general principles, and leaves the application to particular times and circumstances. Under its action monarchy

long held sway. Christ and the Apostles submitted to despotism in the person of the worst emperors of Rome claiming divine honors. Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom under the arbitrary and impulsive sway of the most wicked of princes, as though monarchical power in its last and most Satanic stage should, by divine providence, meet that foe which by slow but sure means would gradually undermine the false claims of kings and restore to man his right to self-government.

Wrapt in the teaching of Jesus lay a bud that would slowly unfold and give forth a fragrance that would rejoice the earth, and furnish a principle that would tend to the healing of the nations—the sovereignty of God and hence the equality of men. Because God is sovereign, no one else can share His sovereignty. All are subject to Him, and all are therefore on the same basis. “Neither be ye called Master: one is your Master.” Matt. xxiii. 10. “Be not many masters, for ye shall receive greater condemnation.” James iii. 1. All distinctions are broken down, because all stand on a level before God. The king and subject, the rich and poor are without respect of persons before God. Who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven? He that humbleth himself even as this little child. “He that is greatest shall be your servant.” These doctrines went in the face of all political teaching. Solon had laid down the law of self-sacrifice to the state as the safety of the state. Some laid down the rule that the best should govern, and that therefore a select few (*Aristoi*) must hold the power of the state. Others held that the masses should rule; but the few may be tyrants, and the many may be as tyrannical as the few. Good government depends not on numbers, but on correct ideas of justice and right. All the ancient republics failed because unsupported by a public opinion which was itself based on the divine law of exact justice to all. Until such a public opinion should be created and maintained no republic could stand against the designing and corrupt; and there was less danger from the bad government of one man than from that of the many, and hence monarchy was preferred to a republic.

Christianity furnished the necessary basis, by sanctifying all the relationships of life, and by laying a foundation for justice and right on the law of God. Man is made a good citizen because he is a regenerated man and seeks the welfare of society, because his heart is right toward God. It is evident that if all the officers of a government were good men, and all the subjects of government good citizens, any form of government could be adapted, under the moulding influence of such men, to the welfare and happiness of the people. While any form of government, in the hands of designing and corrupt men, supported by unhealthy public opinion, would soon subvert the general good to selfish ends.

Christianity first takes hold of the individual and sanctifies his motives and purposes. He thus becomes a source of good to others—a fountain of light and truth to govern and direct others. Man, through the gospel, the sanctifying power of divine grace, is made better and qualified to exercise dominion. Each individual seeks not his own but the welfare of others, and grants to others what he claims for himself. He does to others what he would have others do to him. Each standing, therefore, on the same footing, and each being a source of power in the state. Society is the aggregate of individuals, and when these are properly qualified, a healthy public opinion will control the community and generate institutions which will best accord with such opinion and further the welfare and happiness of the people.

Christianity indirectly but surely prepares the way for those laws which administer equal rights. Laws are based on public opinion, directly or indirectly, and reflect that public opinion. Even in the case of absolute monarchy, where the will of the sovereign becomes the law of the land, public opinion has its effect on the mind of the monarch. He is surrounded by counsellors who are consulted on public affairs. He does not wish to be burdened, and is unable to master details of the multitudinous affairs that claim his attention. He becomes a tool in the hands of his advisers. He is the governed

rather than the governor. The ablest monarch is not free from this power behind the throne, greater than the throne. The advisers and statesmen who surround the king are not absolute even if the king is, and though no hand can touch the king, it can reach his ministers. These are not free from responsibility nor beyond the reach of public opinion. That feeling of accountability disturbs them under the covering of the strongest despotism. A Haman is reached by it under a Persian satrap, and a Wolsey trembles before it under a self-willed Henry. The will of a nation will find some mode of expression. It is too powerful an agent to be repressed entirely, and with an elasticity like that of steam, the force of the rebound equals the force of compression. Christianity in its progress among the nations mastered the old and generated a new public sentiment which reached thrones and peoples. The laws reflected this new condition. King and statesman, though personally not Christian, were influenced by a progressive Christian civilization. The civilized world began to feel the power of the new element.

The progress made by an enlightened Christian sentiment was exceedingly slow as measured by human ideas. For centuries it seemed dormant, and sometimes to be so obscured as to be nearly imperceptible. The foe that met and nearly strangled it was (not only from without but) mainly from its own body. With the degeneracy which began to affect the simplicity of the gospel already in the second century, we find the main representatives using it for their own ulterior purposes and engrafting features upon it utterly foreign to its original spirit and intent. The first step was the distinction between clergy and laity, not as of convenience, but as of divine appointment. The rule laid down by Christ made the clergy to be servants of the people, called and elected by them to the office, and receiving their authority from Him through them. This was reversed, and the clergy made to be an intermediate class between God and the people, the sole channel of divine grace to the Church. That the distinction between

clergy and laity is one of convenience and not of inequality in the New Testament, is made evident by the nature of the office as set forth by Christ. He calls His ministers servants. "He who would be great among you let him be your servant." The idea of a service performed by them constituted their highest claim to a recognition as His agent. But a service to whom? To the people, in the name of the Most High, and regarded as done to Christ, because done to them whom He purchased. Matt. x. 42. The Greek *κλῆρος* is now admitted by the best Church historians, as Neander, Schaff, and Gieseler, to be used in the New Testament as a term of rank without implying any superiority. It designates office, but not by divine appointment, as all Christians are prophets, priests and kings to Christ, and possess consequently all the power of those offices for their own use or for delegation to others, if more convenient; and where the word is used 1 Pet. v. 3, it is applied to the people generally and not to any particular class. All stood on a common level, and the authority of the Church rested in the whole company of believers and not in a particular class. The entire Church decided questions which arose in government and discipline. The selection of an Apostle in place of Judas, though done by ballot, was done in the presence of all the disciples, and with an appeal to them for approval. "They gave forth their lots," (Acts i. 26), which implies a participation by all the disciples present (about 120).

After the ascension of Christ, therefore, the whole body of the disciples select the officers of the Church. When deacons were required for a particular service, the "multitude of the disciples were called together by the Apostles, who said to them, Look ye out seven men of honest report whom we may appoint over this business." The voice of the people here was regarded as the voice of God in the selection of Church officers. At the council of Jerusalem the people were represented, and though the question related to the mission among the Gentiles, all present took part in the proceedings. When officers were necessary for the Church these were chosen by the disciples

and elected to their several positions by a vote. This was true of the most important offices of the Church; much more was it true of the congregational officers. Thus in the government of the early Church we have the true basis of democratic government: First, by the necessary preparation of the individual for the duties of government by the sanctification of the judgment and will and the elevation of the moral faculties for the proper exercise of such important duties; and secondly, the full participation of the people in the choice of rulers by a vote of the whole body of disciples.

The idea of community with equal rights is enforced by the doctrine of co-relation of parts to each and to the whole. The eye cannot say to the ear, we have no need of you, nor the head to the foot, we have no need of you. All are but parts of the body, and equally honorable in their proper place. If there is diversity, it is not because of superiority, but for the general good, each member co-operating in his sphere with all the other members for the common welfare of the whole body. In such a commonwealth there must be a division of labor, but a mutual dependence and sympathy. When one member suffers all the members suffer with it, and when one member is honored all rejoice with it.

The bond that binds this Christian republic in one common interest is the bond of the Spirit. There may be a diversity of gifts, but the same Spirit. All are dependent upon it; all desire it alike. All consequently are on the same level, and no one can claim a monopoly of that Spirit. No one can aspire to the exclusive reception and dispensation of that Spirit. All stand before God as equals, because all are members of Christ. The common term "brethren" applied to the members of the Christian Church, also brings out the equality of relationship existing in the primitive Christian Church. Brothers are by nature on the same level in their common relation to the parent, and charged therefore with the duty of sympathy and common help, giving the true exemplification of equality and fraternity.

Christianity still further furnishes a solid basis for liberty in its highest form by reconciling authority and freedom in the harmony of the human and divine wills. Man is led to do the will of God freely, and finds his happiness in following his free choice, which nevertheless is the choice of God. He obeys the power of divine government with pleasure, because the rebellious will has been fully reconciled to God. Man is free, because the law is not a terror to him, and he obeys it not as the slave, but as the child obeys the parent, from instinct and love. But in human government, the Christian sees the divine government reflected and delegated. The power, whether it comes from God through the people or through a king, comes nevertheless from God, and must be revered and obeyed. For reasons already stated, however, in every Christian state, the people sanctified by the Spirit are on a perfect level before God, and become the depository of the divine power in the world, as they became the depository of the spiritual power in the Church. In every case, therefore, whether delegated to king, parliament, or Congress, the power must be delegated as a mediated power from God through the people.

With these ideas laid down by the Founder of Christianity, and expressed in the apostolic age by the Scriptures, and exemplified in practice by a community in which all took part in the public duties, and no distinction recognized as divine except as it came from the whole body of believers, and as growing out of the necessities of the case, we are made to confront another system which arose already in the second century, and from diminutive preliminaries developed into a vast hierarchical system claiming God as its author, demanding submission to a particular class endowed with exclusive rights; holding the monopoly of divine grace, and opening and shutting the gates of heaven at will. The system developed into a complete monarchy, with the most logical order in its parts and a complete and abject subordination of all inferiors to a ruling class and central head. We do not stop to describe this system which for so many years held its sway in the face of that other

system which we have described; but, if asked to account for the rise of the hierarchical system in the very bosom of Christianity, we say it is no more difficult to account for it than it is to account for the rise of iniquity in the heart of a professing Christian; the Church exhibiting on an extended scale the conflict of light and darkness, and warfare of the law in the mind and the law in the members, as in the case of any individual. If we find no difficulty in accounting for the fall of one man after enlightenment, we ought to find no difficulty in accounting for the fall of a number who preferred the whisperings of selfish ambition to the teachings of the truth.

We pass from the rise of the monarchical system in the Church over the ages when setting the example and combining with monarchy in the state, the masses were kept in submission by a blinding of the intellect and fettering of the hands, to the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, when the human mind, awaking from the incubus that disturbed its dreams and fettered its limbs, repossessed its powers and began to inquire into the wherefore of existing institutions, and to examine the basis upon which they rested.

The sixteenth century found the papacy triumphant at every point, and monarchy so completely in the ascendant that only the rival interests of different monarchs prevented the union of the state and Church in a universal theocracy, as attempted by Charlemagne and Leo III. The unquestioned lust of power revelled in crime and corruption. Princes consulted their arbitrary and selfish impulses, until property and life were sacrificed to an unlimited extent. Church dignitaries felt themselves independent of all accountability, even to the moral law. The monarchical theory was run to the extreme, and in the state the doctrine of divine right of kings was proclaimed as the firm ground on which obedience was claimed for those in authority; while in the Church the theory was held that a Vicegerent of God held absolute power over the kingdoms of the earth, and could, in the name of God, absolve all peoples from allegiance to their sovereigns, or compel them on pain of

eternal death to obey the edicts of the Church. The masses were ignored and the rights of the individual lost in the claims of the temporal lords. The chains were so numerous and forged so tightly that the task of breaking them seemed hopeless. Nor were these fetters easily unriveted. The contest between the people and their oppressors required centuries of struggle, mainly because the fetters had been worn so long that the skin hardened under them, and chafed but little. The first victory gained by the people was the knowledge of their true condition, and in this they were assisted by an insight into the selfish and ambitious characters of priests and lords, and then, with suspicions awakened, they were led to examine the claims upon which government was founded.

When the doctrinal or religious side of the Reformation had achieved its triumph, it had not reached the practical question of popular rights in the state. The reformers did not at once and everywhere attempt the application of their theories to political affairs; but the human mind had thrown off the shackles of spiritual despotism, and could not refrain from an examination into the claims of temporal power. But the reformation had laid down certain principles which must soon produce results. One of these was the right of the individual to read and judge the Bible for himself. This right was claimed by the reformers and boldly proclaimed from a thousand pulpits. The people accepted the doctrine and acted upon it. They had been deceived by a false claim to spiritual sovereignty to which they were required to yield implicit obedience, and might they not be deceived by a similar claim in temporal affairs?

We find accordingly that questions did arise very soon that involved the liberties of the people in temporal things. Who had now the right to appoint the rulers of the Church? Were Church officers the appointments of temporal rulers? Did the Bible teach that the Church is a monarchy or a republic? If a republic, could a temporal monarchy encourage an ecclesiastical republic within its bounds? Several systems of Church

government were evolved at that time which had the most important bearing upon the general question of the rights of the people. But we do not propose to examine the relative merits of episcopacy, presbyterianism and independency in their biblical and ecclesiastical relations. We shall confine ourselves to the political aspect of these theories as they exhibited themselves in the history of the nations which adopted them.

The doctrine that the Church is a monarchy rests upon the claim that Christ committed to the Apostles and their successors the sole right of Church government; that the ministry are the divinely appointed and sole agents of God in the direction of His Kingdom upon earth; that the treasures of divine wisdom are alone in their hands, to be opened or closed at their pleasure. They constitute a close corporation, electing their own successors, and their rights can never be transferred to others. That grace can only reach the individual as it is mediated by them, and the great question for every man to ask in respect to salvation is not a subjective repentance and faith toward God, but how to find the Church, and from the ministry of that Church to receive the sacraments which convey pardon for sin and life to the recipient. Implicit obedience must be rendered to the rulers sent of God. The people have nothing to do with the government. They can only receive that given to them by the ecclesiastical heads. They are slaves under the dominion of a hierarchy. Such a close corporation must necessitate a head. The body must have a centre from which could radiate the power contained in the body. Hence we have a monarch who wills the power. All must be subjected to that head to secure the idea of unity. The Church is one, God is one; hence the government of the Church must be a unit. Here we have a monarchy and centralization based on the divine law and fortified by the example of the Apostles. The system was already in existence in the days of Cyprian, who becomes its earliest great defender. But that system was now in question.

If true, Christianity as it spread through the world would

carry such a monarchical government with it and would everywhere establish monarchical principles. Kings would find the best support for their absolute power in the example of the Church, and from the divine right of priests they could easily pass to the divine right of kings.

Such a view would be enforced by the actual experience of nations. The people were in a degraded and ignorant condition. Would it do to intrust power to a mere rabble? If sufficiently educated to know their power would it not unchain a tiger that would destroy the peace of nations? It would open the cave of winds that would blow a hurricane of anarchy and destroy the foundations of society. A corrupt mob intrusted with power would be an untamed horse to dash the rider to pieces. Had not the fearful and bloody revolutions in all nations sprung from the seizure of power in the hands of a blood-thirsty multitude enraged to fury, but without reflection and judgment to act wisely in the important affairs of State? Such a danger would fill the wise and good with terror, and they would favor the subjection of the masses, and believe it best to hold them in check by the engine of superstition and fear.

Those, who maintained that the Church was a republic would point to the perfect equality of Christians before God; to the efforts put forth by Christ, and the measures instituted by Him for the elevation of the masses; to the absence of all show and worldly ambition in the early disciples; to the voice of the people in all the Church councils, and to the primitive congregations, as examples of popular government. They would show that Christianity would so elevate and instruct the multitude, that they would become good citizens and better qualified to decide affairs of State than corrupt and selfish kings and priests, who used their position for self-emolument to the oppression and injury of the people. In particular, they would show that the Church is the whole body of Christians, and that thus constituted, the power of the Church is the power of the people, who are members of it, and that each member being a prophet, priest and king unto Christ, has in himself all the elements of government.

The essential difference between these systems depends on the definition we give to the Church. If the Church is a close corporation we have monarchy. If the Church is the company of faithful men in Christ, we have a republic. Whence, then, have we this latter definition of the Church, and how does it come forward at the time of the Reformation?

From the fourth century the essential feature of admission to the Church was a promise of obedience to the rulers, and later, a promise of "true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ." Although no formal definition of the Church was given this virtually placed the whole essence and power of the Church in the hands of the bishops, and afterward of the Pope.

From the time of the Reformation a new definition comes forward. The earliest Creed of the Reformation is the articles of Ulrich Zwinglius, framed and discussed, in 1523. In these articles Christ is pronounced to be the head of the Church, and all Christians to be members of His body. The Church is the communion of saints, and all believers are equal before Christ. The Augsburg Confession, published in 1530, declared the Church to be the congregation of saints. The first Helvetic Confession, 1536, defines the Church to be the communion and community of believers. The power of the Keys is given to the whole Church, and the office of the ministry to those called by the Church as servants of the Church. All the subsequent Protestant formulas followed in the same wake—the Church was made up of the people. The people constituted the Church; held the power of the Church; chose the rulers of the Church. As a consequence of this view of the Church, the people felt themselves called upon to exercise citizenship in this commonwealth of Israel. The officers were elected by ballot. The citizens discussed measures concerning the common welfare. The congregational meeting was a popular gathering. Thus the Church introduced the fundamental elements of popular government or democracy. The Church was a republic.

The full consequences of this new order of things were not

apparent at once. The people prayed for kings and all in authority. They rendered tribute to Cæsar. No attempts were made to change political government. Christians aimed only at that Christian liberty of thinking and speaking, which were vouchsafed to them in the Bible. They ruled in the Church. They were not so much concerned with affairs of State.

And yet it was impossible that the liberty enjoyed in the Church should not have its influence on the State. When men began to discuss the principles of liberty, and the oppression of ecclesiastical tyranny, they were not far from a discussion of the rights of liberty in the State. The retroactive influence of ecclesiastical liberty manifested itself in many ways as a general force, not confined to the Church. The despotism of the Pope had been thrown off by a victory assured only after a bloody field and years of fiery warfare. Kings could not fail to take warning and to feel the foundation giving way under their feet.

It was in the Reformed Church that the application of the general principle to the State first began to display itself. Switzerland, the mountain home of the chamois free to leap from crag to crag, became the early home of an aspiration to be as free as the animals that snuffed the exhilarating air of her lofty peaks. Wherever the Reformed Faith took hold of the people, there the rights of the masses began to assert themselves, and self-government from the Church passed over to a self-government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Basle gives an instance of the manner in which this victory was inaugurated. The doctrines of the Reformation had been preached and had taken hold of the minds of the people, but the Senate refused to take measures to abolish the mass and to reform the churches; after using persuasion of a milder kind to urge the Senate, and finding it still disobedient to the will of the majority, the people flew to arms, and overawing them induced them to listen to what was now plainly the desire of the people. The Senate yielded on a few points, but still followed their own councils, when perceiving the necessity of

their position they yielded to the spirit of the times and removed the images, and reformed the service; but not content with this the people insisted on the right of electing the senate, or of at least a representation in it. This too, after a conflict, was yielded, and the people had now the means of legalizing their measures through their own representatives. Democracy was introduced into the state co-ordinately with reform in the Church. Liberty in the one was necessary to its assured stability in the other.

The Reformed were especially urgent in carrying their principles to logical results. They made the Bible the only rule of faith and *practice*. Nothing could be admitted that was not authorized by this authority. Everything must be rejected if not in full conformity with its letter and spirit. They could find no authority for a Pope and bishop in the Bible. The presbyter and bishop were the same office-bearers. These were elected by the people. The church-government laid down in the Bible called for synods, in which the people and clergy were represented on a perfectly equal basis, and questions were decided by a vote in which one was as potent as another. They could find no authority for prelacy or monarchy in the word of God. Hence they abolished them from the Church and made the people to be the source of power in church-government. The officers of each congregation were chosen from the membership by a vote at a congregational meeting. These constituted a vestry for the government of the congregation. Each congregation in turn would send delegates to a classis or presbytery. These had jurisdiction over a limited territory. The presbytery, or classis, in turn would send delegates to a higher body which ruled over a wider territory, and so on, until the whole Church was brought under necessary discipline and order. This admirable system secured the full representation of all interests. It presented a model of representative government to the age in which it was devised. Free Switzerland gave the first impulse. Geneva brought the system into practical operation. A system of church-courts was brought forward by which

a cause, begun in a lower judicatory, could be appealed to a higher, and this again until the final tribunal could be reached. It presented thus, not the disorder and anarchy of a town meeting, nor the unbridled license of an irresponsible mob, but the popular will embodied in law and the self-subjection of the people to their own enactments.

The principles lying under this order of church-government, had its effect in the state, and formed a model which challenged imitation in political government. Soon the spirit of liberty which suggested and devised the one found exemplification in the other. The combined effect stimulated the people to the defence of the principles of liberty and to develop a Christian patriotism which brought to the front some of the noblest champions of popular rights in their unselfish devotion to the advancement of the human race and the progress of enlightened government.

To these the illustrious reformer, Ulric Zwinglius, set a distinguished example. Right and justice with him were not confined to the Church. The principles of the doctrine of Christ were not confined to the boundaries of a single community or interest. The Gospel is a leaven designed to leaven the whole humanity, and to find its way into all departments of life. He desired the welfare of his fellow-men in every way. He labored to advance the cause of all human liberty, because it was good and right in itself. Religion with him was not a cunning priestcraft which sought the advancement of the Church by oppressing the state and humanity. It was that wide charity which looked upon mankind with extended gaze, and in the broad spirit of Christ Himself. Because he loved Christ and the Church, he loved his country and defended the rights of his fellow-citizens. He saw that popery was the ally of despotism in the state as well as the right hand of superstition in the Church. When, therefore, the enemy was at the gate it was not enough for him to sit still and give a quiet consent. He must help on the good cause by his example. So secretly and treacherously had the Romanists made their preparation

that without notice to the reformed an army of eight thousand men approached suddenly before the walls of Zurich breathing slaughter and vengeance. Was that a time for a patriot to be indifferent to the cause of truth and liberty? Zwinglius goes to the front as chaplain of the army. He wears a sword because it was then customary. He prays for the success of the cause of truth and right. If ever a war was justifiable that was in which the Christian patriot gave his life.

And that cause thus heroically defended exerted its influence upon neighboring States. Wherever the reformed faith established itself, civil liberty followed in its track. Holland, the land of dikes and canals, no sooner received a pure Gospel than it felt stirrings of civil liberty in its veins and fought long and heroically for independence and the rights of conscience. With the great empires of Spain and Germany at its throat and the most illustrious army of Europe arrayed against it, the brave people amid untold sufferings not only maintained their cause but wrested from Spain the commercial sceptre of the world and became the champions of Protestantism and civil liberty in Europe.

Geneva, a little city among the lakes of Switzerland, receives a Farel and Viret as refugees from the persecutions of other lands. They are reinforced by a Calvin, who passes through the city on a journey. These men preach the faith of St. Paul, and exemplify it by an austere simplicity and strict purity of life. The city, converted to the Gospel, applies the precepts of the Bible to civil government. Under the lead of Calvin the city becomes a reflex of representative church-government. The Bible became the constitution of the State, and the enactments of the Mosaic law, so far as applicable, were made the laws for the commonwealth. The Swiss Republics exerted a confirmatory influence upon Geneva. Geneva in its turn widened the field into which were sown the seeds of republican liberty, and sent forth its ideas into England and Scotland. The Presbyterians caught their inspiration from the mind of Calvin, and Knox went forth not only as the invinci-

ble foe of prelacy, but as an opponent of the corrupt government of Mary and the tyranny of the Papists. In England the Puritans, imbibing at the same fountain, worked at the principles of the English Commonwealth. That commonwealth was the result of ideas drawn from the Bible in connection with views of church-government. Republicanism and Protestantism went hand in hand, and that form of Protestantism which was farthest removed from popery was the strongest support of civil liberty. Monarchy and prelacy were almost one and inseparable: Said James I. to those who claimed freedom of worship, "There is as much harmony between monarchy and Presbytery as between God and the devil." Kings feared the progress of Calvinism as the sure forerunner of civil liberty, and priests feared it as the engine that would lift the masses from degradation to intelligence and from blind obedience to enlightened examination.

The conflict in England brought about reforms, not by a single blow, but in a succession of reforms; not by a single revolution, but by a series of popular upheavals fought out more in parliament and through the press than on the field. In every social convulsion the principles brought over from Geneva made themselves felt in the triumphant advance of liberal ideas. From England the Puritans brought the same ideas of Church and State to America. They founded the civil commonwealth upon theocratic connected with democratic ideas drawn from the Bible. Their governments were modeled after patterns which they had studied in connection with the universal Kingship of believers. We need not trace these views as they developed themselves in New England and from New England to other parts of the United States. The progress of the reformed faith in England sent forth the offshoots of a tree that had its roots on the continent of Europe. And that tree has been growing vigorously ever since. It has sent its branches into France, Germany and Italy, and to other parts of Europe. Wherever advanced Protestantism has gone it has carried civil liberty with it. Those ideas based on the Bible form the only

basis of a true republic. The American Republic drew its inspiration, in its early life, from that source, and the need of France at the present time, is not only a break with clerical government; a deliverance from the shackles of a faith that seeks to fortify itself by the decree of infallibility, but a living faith based on the word of God, and the education of the masses not only in the sciences of practical life and political economy, but most especially in the virtues of obedience to God and the rights of man as laid down in Magna Charta of eternal life.

With the progress of liberty in our own land we are familiar. The reflex influence which it is exerting at the present day on other countries is making itself more and more evident every year, but do we carefully remember that this liberty has come down to us through religious channels? that the pulpit has been more effectual in asserting the rights of man than the forum, and that evangelical Protestantism has been the most potent element in modern civil liberty? Do we give sufficient credit to an enlightened Christianity for what it has done for the state in securing peace, obedience to law, and fraternity in a common bond of mankind on abiding foundations in the word of God?

In particular, do we give sufficient credit to the Reformed Church for its agency in planting the cause of civil liberty on a soil which can nourish it with the water of heaven and the elements of eternal truth? In our brief remarks we have traced the cause of modern liberty from the Bible to the time of the Reformation, when religious liberty renewedly asserted itself. We have seen that the nations which were foremost in the cause of human rights and where the battle of freedom was waged with greatest success were precisely those nations which had received the reformed faith. Romanism from its essential principles was monarchical, and opposed with fire and sword the cause of popular liberty. Luther was busy with doctrine, and did not concern himself about the practical effect of the Reformation on politics. Lutheran countries, as Denmark,

Sweden, Germany remained monarchical, and did not feel the stirrings of popular rights as the consequence of religious emancipation, while Switzerland, Holland, England and the United States everywhere gave proof that the Reformed faith was not a code of empty platitudes, but a living power running down into every fibre of the body politic and renovating society to its inmost core.

The treasures thus accumulated during several centuries have not been allowed to lie unproductive. Ever increasing in extent and value, they have come down to us as a sacred inheritance valuable for the immense practical results in commerce, literature, science and civil liberty, working out the highest form of civilization the world has yet known.

It behooves us as the inheritors of so valuable a deposit to investigate closely, and so the more fully to understand the relationship we bear to the earlier period; to feel our responsibility as custodians of a liberty wrought out with so much toil and sacrifice; to appreciate the excellence of our liberal institutions and to defend the principles handed down to us, remembering the unceasing activity of the old enemy of the Protestant, and therefore, of the popular cause of liberty the vast strength of the hierarchical and monarchical forces in the old world and the bitter struggle now going on in such countries as France, Spain and Italy for a free faith as the only foundation for republican institutions.

When these and other lands have achieved the victory of the reformed faith, then and not till then will they be prepared for a well-balanced liberty, safe from communism on the one side and despotism on the other.

ART. IX. — ETYMOLOGY AND PRIMITIVE SIGNIFICATION
OF THE WORD RELIGIO.

TRANSLATED FROM VOIGT'S FUNDAMENTALDOGMATIK, BY THOMAS M.
BALLIET, PROFESSOR IN KEYSTONE STATE NORMAL SCHOOL,
KUTZTOWN, PA.

AN investigation into the etymology and primitive meaning of the word *religio* is of great importance to a correct apprehension of the nature of religion itself. This is shown by the striking fact that not only the German language since the sixteenth century, after the example of Luther, but also the languages of all European nations, as well as those of other nations influenced by the Europeans, have adopted this term to designate a definite life-relation between man and God, and have pressed into the background their native terms expressing this relation. It is impossible that the authority of Luther should have acquired for the word this general acceptance; for he employed it but seldom,* and moreover it is impossible to show any influence of the German over the other European languages with reference to the use of this word. Nor can its universal adoption be solely attributed to the reign of Humanism, which, along with the general classical culture of the age, introduced many Latin and Greek terms into the modern languages of Europe. Even if (what can not be denied) Humanism mediated the transition of the word into the general usage of the European languages, yet such mediation can not be conceived of as

* See especially Luther's *Tischreden*, Frankfurt, 1576, chap. i., p. 15: "Von Religionsachen soll man nach Gottes Wort urtheilen." Chap. v., p. 64: "Darum ist allerlei Religion, sie habe einen Namen und Schein, so gross und heilig es sein mag, da man Gott ohne sein Wort und Befehl dienen will, nichts anders denn Aberglaube." Chap. lxxxvii., p. 288: "Auf dem Reichstage zu Regensburg liess Paul Riccius ein Buch ausgehen, in welchem Moses und Paulus ein Gespräch halten, wie die Sprüche, so jetzt in der Religion Streitig sind, verglichen werden Könnten."

possible without the assumption of another important fact. This fact is to be found only in an affinity between the primitive signification of the word and the essential features of a definite life-relation between God and man, common to all nations and belonging to man by nature.

In this investigation, we must, however, not regard the etymological sense of the word as necessarily identical with its historical sense or the later usage of the language. For the usage of the language, in the case of this word, as in the case of many others, may have departed more or less from its primitive or etymological meaning with the development of the national life of the Romans. Since there have been many attempts made to determine the primary meaning of this word, it may serve our purpose to present, in chronological order, the various explanations that have been given, and then by means of a criticism of the same open the way for the explanation which we believe must be regarded as the correct one. It will therefore be necessary to give full and accurate citations from the various authorities.

Cicero, as is well known, proposed an etymological explanation of this word by deriving it from *relegere*, and accordingly explained *religio* as a care or solicitude in the worship of the gods, resting on awe (Scheu) and reverential fear (Aengstlichkeit). *De Nat. Deorum*, ii. 28: *Cultus autem deorum est optimus idemque castissimus atque sanctissimus plenissimusque pietatis, ut eos semper pura, integra, incorrupta et mente et voce veneremur. Non enim philosophi solum, verum etiam majores nostri superstitionem a religione separaverunt. Nam qui totos dies precabantur et immolabant, ut sui sibi liberi superstites essent, superstitiosi sunt appellati, quod nomen postea latius patuit. Qui autem omnia, quæ ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tanquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo, ut elegantes ex eligendo, tanquam a diligendo diligentes, ex intelligendo intelligentes. His enim in verbis omnibus inest vis legendi eadem, quæ in religioso. Ita factum est in superstitioso et religioso alterum vitii nomen,*

alterum laudis. Also De Invent. ii. 53: "Religio est, quæ superioris cujusdam naturæ, quam divinam vocant, curam cærimoniamque affert." Whilst in these passages there attaches to the word *religio* or *religiosus*, already in and of itself, a reference to the divine Being, it is to be observed that in the following passages it has a more general sense, and obtains that reference only through the subordinate, qualifying clauses. De Invent. ii. 22, Religionem eam, quæ in metu et cærimonia deorum est, appellant pietatem. De Leg. ii. 11: Tum maxime et pietas et religio versatur in animis, quum rebus divinis operam damus. Hence in the time of Cicero the word was yet vacillating between a more general and a more particular signification.

Another writer, likewise belonging to the classical period of the Latin language, derives *religiosus*, and with it also *religio*, from *relinquere*, understanding by *religiosus* the quality of that which is separated on account of its holiness, and withdrawn from the turmoil of the throng; and by *religio*, as is evident from the explanation of Gellius, the subjective feeling corresponding to this quality or attribute, namely: the awe, now mingled with fear, now with reverence, with which the subject is inspired, in approaching such an object. Notwithstanding the difference in derivation, the signification of *religio* according to this explanation agrees with that of Cicero. For this reason the above derivation, though manifestly false, deserves notice in spite of its erroneousousness. Macrobius, moreover, adopted this derivation, and attempted, though, it is true, in a very artificial way, to prove it also from Virgil. As to who first proposed this derivation, his statement differs from that of Gellius. He ascribes it to Servius Sulpicius, the cotemporary of Cicero, whilst, on the other hand, Gellius attributes it to Masurius Sabinus, who lived in the reign of Tiberius. The more precise statement of Gellius speaks in favor of the latter view. Noct. Att. iv. 9: Masurius Sabinus in commentariis, quos de indigenis composuit, religiosum, inquit, est, quod propter sanctitatem aliquam remotum ac sepositum a nobis est; verbum a

relinquendo dictum, tamquam cærimonie a carendo. Secundum hanc Sabini interpretationem templa quidem ac delubra, quia horum cumulus in vituperationem non cadit, ut illorum, quorum laus immodesta est, religiosa sunt, quæ non vulgo ac temere, sed cum castitate cærimoniaque adeunda et reverenda et reformidanda sunt magis quam invulganda. On the contrary Macrobius says, Saturn. Conviv. iii. 3: Superest ut, quid sit religiosum, cum Virgilio communicamus. Servius Sulpicius religionem esse dictam tradidit, quæ propter sanctitatem aliquam remota et seposita a nobis sit, quasi a relinquendo dicta, ut a carendo cærimonia. Hoc Virgilius servans ait:

Est ingens gelidum lucus prope Cæretis amnem
Religione patrum late sacer,

et adjecit, quo proprietatem religionis exprimeret:

Undique colles
Inclusere cavi et nigra nemus abiete cingit (Cingunt, Æn. viii. 597-99).

quæ res utique faciebat lucum a populi communicatione secretum et, ut relictum locum ostenderet non solum adeundi facultate, adjecit et sanctitatem.

Among Christian writers, Arnobius adopted Cicero's etymology, whilst, however, he remarks that the conception of heathen religiousness (religiosität), based upon that etymology, is not adequate to the idea of true religiousness. Adv. Nation. iv. 30: Non enim, qui sollicite relegit et immaculatas hostias cædit, qui acervos turis dat concremandos igni, numina consentiendus est colere aut officia solus religionis implere. Cultus verus in pectore est.

On the other hand Lactantius afterwards advanced a different derivation and explanation of *religio*, in express opposition to Cicero, by taking as its root the verb religare and defining it as a being bound to God (ein Gebundensein an Gott); more precisely, as a moral obligation toward Him as Creator, Lord and Father, grounded in reverence and love. Inst. Div. iv. 28: Apparet, nullam aliam spem vitæ homini esse propositam, nisi

ut abjectis vanitatibus et errore miserabili deum cognoscat et deo serviat, nisi huic temporali renuntiet vitæ ac se rudimentis justitiæ ad cultum veræ religionis instituat. Hac enim conditione gignimur, ut generanti nos deo justa et debita obsequia præbeamus, hunc solum noverimus, hunc sequamur. Hoc vinculo pietatis obstricti deo et religati sumus, unde ipsa religio nomen accepit, non, ut Cicero interpretatus est, a relegendo.—Diximus nomen religionis a vinculo pietatis esse deductum, quod hominem sibi deus religaverit et pietate obstrinxerit, quia nos servire ei ut domino et obsequi ut patri necesse est.

Comparing this definition of Lactantius with that of Cicero, we may, in general, express the difference as follows: Whilst the latter corresponds to the heathen conception of religion, the former is grounded in the Christian conception, and that with a coloring of its Old Testament form. In the former the divine Being is conceived of in His general nature as a being exalted above all things; in the latter He is apprehended in a monotheistic form as a personal being, as the sole Lord of all things, as the Creator and Law-giver of the world. The former characterizes religion in general as a reverent bearing or behaviour; the latter as a moral obedience to God and as a fulfilling of law and obligation. In the former the divine Being appears as the unapproachable, as widely separated from man; in the latter He comes to view as a being that has entered into a relation of intimate communion with man. These points of difference must be especially held in view when we come to decide between the two etymologies of the word.

In all the succeeding centuries, except the present (in which the etymological study of language has taken entirely new directions through the study of comparative philology), theology never got beyond the two derivations and explanations given by Cicero and Lactantius, at one time embracing the one, at another time the other. Jerome follows the etymology of Lactantius, Amos c. 9. Augustine for a long time vacillated between the two etymologies, in the former of which he saw the idea of a re-election and recovery of what has been lost, viz.

God, the highest Good. De Civ. Dei, x. 4: Ad hunc verum deum videndum, sicut videri poterit, eique cohærendum ab omni peccatorum et cupiditatum malarum labe mundamur et ejus nomine consecramur. Ipse enim fons nostræ beatitudinis, ipse omnis appetitionis est finis. Hunc eligentes vel potius religentes, unde et religio dicta perhibetur, ad eum dilectione tendimus, ut perveniendo quiescamus. So likewise De Div. Quæst. 31, where he defines religion in the very words of Cicero (De Invent. ii. 58): Religio est, quæ superioris cujusdam naturæ, quam divinam vocant, curam cærimoniamque affert.

In the following passages he adopts the etymology of Lactantius. Retract. i. 13: Uni deo religantes animas nostras, unde religio dicta creditur. De Vera Relig. 55: Quid metui-
mus, ne aliquem illorum (angelorum) offendamus, si non superstitiosi fuerimus, quum ipsis adjuvantibus ad unum deum tendentes et ei uni religantes animas nostras, unde religio dicta creditur, omni superstitione careamus.—Religet ergo nos religio uni omnipotenti deo, quia inter mentem nostram, qua illum intelligimus patrem, et veritatem nulla interposita creatura est. The derivation from *religare* accords best also with the following passage, in which Augustine remarks that *religio* primarily had reference to a regard for the relationship between kindred, and afterwards came to be used to designate the relation between man and God, De Civ. x. 1: Latine uno verbo significari cultus deo debitus non potest. Nam et ipsa religio quamvis distinctius non quemlibet, sed dei cultum significare videatur, unde isto nomine interpretati sunt nostri eam, quæ Græce *θρησκεία* dicitur; tamen quia Latina loquendi consuetudine, non solum imperitorum, verum etiam doctissimorum, et cognitionibus humanis atque affinitatibus et quibusque necessitudinibus dicitur exhibenda religio, non eo vocabulo vitatur ambiguum, quum de cultu deitatis vertitur quæstio, ut fidenter dicere valeamus, religionem esse nisi dei cultum, quoniam videtur hoc verbum a significanda observantia propinquitatis humanæ insolenter auferri. At the close of his life Augustine expressly abandoned Cicero's explanation, and altogether adopted that of

Lactantius, without stating, it is true, any reasons for the change, *Retract. i. 13*: Item alio loco (*De Vera Rel. 55*), ad unum deum tendentes, inquam, et ei uni religantes animas nostras, unde religio dicta creditur, omni superstitione careamus. In his verbis meis ratio, quæ reddita est, unde sit dicta religio, plus mihi placuit. Nam non me fugit aliam nominis hujus originem exposuisse Latini sermonis auctores, quod inde sit appellata religio, quod religitur, quod verbum compositum est a legendo id est eligendo, ut ita Latinum videatur religio sicut eligio.

Isidore afterwards, manifestly on the ground of this last statement of Augustine, adopted at the same time Cicero's etymology and Lactantius' definition of *religio*, *Isid. Orig. viii. 2*: Religio appellata, quod per eam uni deo religamus animas nostras ad cultum divinum vinculo serviendi. Quod verbum compositum est a religendo, id est eligendo, ut ita Latinum videatur religio sicut eligio. The poor linguistic qualifications of Isidore, manifested in this remark, find further evidence (worthy of notice because of its bearing on the etymological investigation of language on the part of the ancients) in the fact that he derived *fides* from *fieri*, and *spes* from *pes*: *Proprie nomen fidei inde est dictum, si omnino fiat, quod dictum est. Est inde fides vocata ab eo, quod fit illud, quod inter utrosque placitum est. Spes vocata, quod sit spes progrediendi, quasi est pes. Unde contrarium desperatio. Deest enim ibi pes nullaque progrediendi facultas est.*

Thomas Aquinas cites both Cicero's explanation and the two given by Augustine, without deciding definitely in favor of either. *Sec. Secundæ Qu. 81, Art. 1, Concl.*: Religiosus, ut ait Cicero, a religione appellatus est, qui retractat et tamquam re-eligit ea, quæ ad cultum divinum pertinent. Et sic religio videtur dicta a re-eligendo ea, quæ sunt divini cultus, quia hujus modi sunt frequenter in corde revolvenda—quamvis etiam possit intelligi religio ex hoc dicta, quod deum re-eligere debemus, quem amiseramus negligentes, sicut Augustinus dicit. Vel potest intelligi religio a religando dicta, unde Augustinus dicit

in libro de vera Religione: Religet nos religio uni omnipotenti deo. Sive autem religio dicatur a frequenti electione, sive ex iterata electione ejus, quod negligenter amissum est, sive dicatur a religatione: religio proprie importat ordinem ad deum. Ipse enim est, cui principaliter alligari debemus tamquam indeficienti principio, ad quem etiam nostra electio assidue dirigi debet, sicut in ultimum finem, quem etiam negligenter peccando amittimus et credendo et fidem protestando recuperare debemus.

In the period of the Reformation we find Zwingli adopting the Ciceronian etymology. De Vera et Falsa Rel. (Op. Omn. III., p. 155): Religionis vocabulum a relegendo Cicero derivatum esse putat, quod, qui religiosi essent, sollicitè cuncta retractarent ac velut relegerant, quæ quidem vocabuli ratio nobis quoque accommodata est.

The Protestant writers on Dogmatics, Lutherans as well as Reformed, gave their preference for the most part to the definition of Lactantius—not, however, on linguistic grounds, but for dogmatic reasons, since it accorded better with the essential nature of the Christian religion—a circumstance which we shall be obliged to urge against the correctness of the etymology and definition of Lactantius. Hollox (Exam. Theol. ed. Teller, p. 32): Religionem alii a religando, alii a relegendo dictam volunt. Secundum priorem derivationem religio est ad verum dei cultum obligatio ceu ratio hominem obligans ad debitum atque officium. Secundum posteriorem etymologiam religio est diligens tractatio eorum, quæ ad cultum dei pertinent. Prior derivatio plerisque placet theologis. Furthermore Danaus (Isag. chr., p. 1): Religionis nomen a religando originem habet. Est autem spirituale vinculum, quo homines sancta quadam reconciliatione cum deo uniuntur inque ipsius amore ac timore continentur, ut tandem gloriæ ejus cœlestis vitæque beatæ fiant participes.

It is only during the first half of the present century that the question concerning the etymology and primitive signification of the word *religio* has been made a matter of thorough and extensive investigation. The view of Lactantius was

adopted, among others, also by Ammon (*Summa Th.*, § 1, *Ausführl. Unterricht I.*, p. 11), Baumgarten Crusius (*Einleitung*, p. 3), Hahn (*Lehrbuch des Chr. Gl.* 2d Ed. I., p. 24), and also with considerable modifications by Redslob. (*Sprachl. Abhandl.*, 1840, No. 1) and by Fleck (*System der Dogm.* 1846, I., p. 1). The two last, in agreement with Wegscheider (*Inst. Th.*, § 1, Anm.), explain the simple verb *ligare* as equivalent in meaning to *legere*. According to Wegscheider both are to denote *colligere*, to collect, lay together; but according to Fleck the latter is to imply the idea of binding, and from the parallel forms *colligere* and *colligare*, the simple form *ligare* is to have originated. On the basis of this etymology, *religio* means: 1) *religatio*, *vinculum religans*, i. e. that quality of an object that restrains man from approaching, touching or injuring it; 2) the corresponding subjective feeling of awe and fear to approach the object.

Cicero's etymology was adopted by Paulus (*Der Denkgläubige I.*, p. 50), Bretschneider (*Dogm.*, 1828, I., p. 1), C. J. Nitzsch (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1828, p. 527 in the Art.: *Ueber den Religionsbegriff der Alten*, auch dessen System, p. 7), and by J. G. (!) Müller (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1835, p. 121 in the Art.: *Ueber Bildung und Begriff des Wortes religio*). After the two last-named admirable dissertations, which, although they agree with respect to the etymology, yet differ materially in regard to the original conception of *religio* (Nitzsch finding in it the idea of religious regard and observance, Müller on the other hand more correctly that of awe and religious scrupulousness), the more recent theologians have, for the most part, followed the etymology of Cicero, which corresponds to the heathen conception of religion. Only a few, as Lange (*Dogm. I.*, p. 189) and Philippi (*Dogm. I.*, p. 6), have allowed themselves to be made uncertain by Fleck's discussion, and have left the question undecided.

An entirely new etymology, which, however, has gained but little acceptance, has been advanced on the basis of comparative philology, by J. C. Leidenroth (*Neue Jahrbücher für*

Philologie und Pädagogik von Seebode, Jahn und Klotz, 1834, page 455, and in his *Lexici Etymologici Specimen*, 1836, p. 35). His etymology was adopted essentially by Bräunig (*Religio nach Ursprung und Bedeutung*, 1837), and by Waldau (*Lücke's und Wieseler's Vierteljahrsschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, iv., p. 259). Leidenroth starts out (p. 457) with what seems to him a striking phenomenon, viz. that the verbs *diligere*, *negligere* and *intelligere*, which are usually regarded as compounds of *lego*, have perfects different from that of *lego*; and that their meanings can be derived from *lego* only in a forced and far-fetched way. He therefore assumes a lost transitive root *ligere*: Sanskrit *lok*, English look, German lügen, Greek *λεωσσω*, from which he derives the Latin *lucere* and *liquere*, and then also the substantive *religio*. So that *diligere* means to view with care and affection; *negligere*, not to see, overlook; *intelligere*, to look into, to understand; but *religere* to look back (*respicere*), so that *religio*, accordingly, is *respectus*, *reverentia*. For fear on account of something mysterious, awful, or venerable, expresses itself in looking back, and *religio* characterizes this fear as a holy awe and reverence for the Gods. This explanation, though widely different from that of Cicero in point of etymology, agrees with it substantially in its final result.

In turning now to the criticism of the various etymologies and explanations of *religio*, presented in their chronological order, we may, without further remark, dismiss the derivation from *relinquere*, as manifestly untenable. We may also briefly dispose of the above explanation of Leidenroth. It fails in the main point from the fact that the verbs *diligere*, *negligere* and *intelligere* not only can, but really must be derived from *lego*, and that in consequence of this the Latin language furnishes not a single point of evidence in favor of a root verb *ligere*, to see. 1. The three verbs *diligo*, *negligo* and *intelligo*, in agreement with other verbal derivatives of *legere*, in a few passages yet form their perfects without the *s*, as *intelligerint*, *negligisset*, *negligerit*. So that the form in *xi* must be referred to *legere* as its root; and on account of its agreement with the similar

aorist form of the corresponding Greek verb *λεγειν* (*eleḡa*) it appears rather to have been but the more primitive form of the perfect. 2. So many manuscripts have preserved the original stem-vowel *e* in those three verbs (*intellegere*, *neglegere*, *dilegere*) that many of the more recent philologists prefer this orthography to the form in *i*. 3. Finally, the signification of those three compounds may be easily explained from the root *legere*, as we shall show hereafter in the discussion of *relegere*. There we shall also notice the negative and therefore subordinate arguments of Leidenroth's etymology, *i. e.*, those arguments that were brought to bear against Cicero's etymology, and shall show them to be unsatisfactory.

The etymology of Lactantius deserves a much more extended notice than that of Leidenroth. A succession of the most prominent theologians down to the present time have advocated it, as has already been shown in the foregoing citations. A few, such as Redslob and Fleck gave it their decided preference after a most thorough investigation. Nevertheless we are obliged to pronounce it incorrect.

With reference to Redslob's and Fleck's defense of it, we must consider it first of all as a philological impossibility: 1) to take the primitive meaning of *legere* to be *to bind*; 2) to regard *colligere* and *colligare* as perfectly co-ordinate derivatives of *legere*, and finally, 3) to derive *ligare* from *colligare* as a secondary verbal root and as a parallel form to *legere*. If these points were philologically possible we should indeed be at a loss to know what could be philologically impossible.

On the other hand we readily concede in general that *religio* may be brought philologically into the most intimate connection with *religare*, whether, as was done formerly, it be derived immediately from *religare*, or a lost verbal form of the third conjugation be assumed (*ligere*=*legere*) as the root of both, as comparative philology has been doing since the time of Bopp. So *opinio*, *optio*, *adoptio* and *rebellio* are abstract nouns in *io* that stand in the same connection with verbs of the first conjugation, and show that not all nouns of this kind, connected with verbs of the first conjugation and denoting action, are, as Nitzsch (*Stud. und*

Krit., 1828, p. 534), holds, constructed after the participial forms, as is indeed the case, for instance with *consonare*, *consonans*, *consonantia*, *consolari*, *consolatus*, *consolatio*, *donare*, *donatus*, *donatio*. However the word *postulio*, commonly adduced in this connection, cannot at all be used to support the etymology of Lactantius. For as Nitzsch (in the Art. above mentioned, p. 536) already conjectured in reference to the passage in Varro (Lib. 4, p. 41, ed. Bip.),* and as we found corroborated in Arnobius (C. Gent. 4, 31),† this word is not an abstract (*postulatio*), but a concrete noun, like *stellio*, *pugio*, *papilio*, since it denotes an object required for expiation, a *piaculum*. Hence *postulio* cannot be cited as an example to prove the derivation of an abstract noun in *io*, like *religio*, from a verb of the first conjugation. Moreover we may remark in passing, with reference to the root *postulio*, that it occurs not once only (as J. G. Miller in the above named Art. p. 126 supposes), but four times, being found yet, besides the passages referred to, in Cicero De Harusp. Resp. 10, 20 and 14, 31; and that it is more correctly written *postilio*, like *consilium* from *consulere*, (Hildebrand on Arnobius, p. 392).

With these concessions to the etymology of Lactantius, made also by J. G. Miller (in above-mentioned Art., p. 125), and by C. J. Nitzsch (System., p. 7),‡ the question is, however, not at all decided. For philologically there can also be no objection whatever to the derivation of *religio* from *relegere*. In case of the third conjugation likewise abstract nouns are formed not only from the participial stem, as *lego*, *lectus*, *lectio*, but also imme-

* A procilio relatum, in eo loco dehisse terram et ex senatus consulto ad haruspices relatum, esse responsum, Deum Maximum postulionem postulare, id est civem fortissimum eodem mitti, tum quandam Curtium cum equo in eum precipitatum.

† Si in caerimoniis vestris rebusque divinis postilionibus (*postulionibus*) locus est et piaculis dicitur contracta esse commissio (*vergehen*), si per imprudentiae lapsum aut verbo quispiam aut simpuvio deerrarit—audetis abnuere in delictis tam gravibus violari semper a vobis deos?

‡ J. G. Miller supposes that *religio*, like *opinio* *optio*, etc., may have been formed from the simple stem of the corresponding verb of the first conjugation; C. J. Nitzsch on the other hand thinks that verbs of the third conjugation underlie the corresponding forms of the first, so that *optare* is a derivative of *optere*, *ligare* of *legere*, etc.

diately from the present stem, as *lego*, *legio*, (Varro, ed Bip. p. 69), *rego*, *regio*, so also *capiō* and *oblivio*. From *relegere* (= *religere*) might be formed not only *religētia*, like *diligētia* from *diligere*, nor merely *relectio*, like *electio* from *eligere*, but also *religio* like *eligio* from *eligere*. The decision between the etymology of Cicero and that of Lactantius, in our opinion, must be made from the two following arguments, and that in favor of Cicero's. Since we do not at all appeal to the authority of Cicero in these arguments, there cannot be urged against them the fact that Cicero explained also the word *superstitio* incorrectly, both as to etymology and meaning; so much the less indeed since Lactantius (Inst., 4, 28), also gave a false derivation and explanation of the same word. The two decisive arguments are the following:

1. Philologically the question will be decided by the apothegm (Gnomē), at all events very ancient, which Nigidius Figulus (†44 B. C.), as Aulus Gellius tells, quotes from an ancient poem in his Grammatical Commentary, and to which C. J. Nitzsch, in the above-mentioned article, first called attention. Gell. Noct. Att. iv: 9, Nigidius Figulus, homo, ut ego arbitrator, Juxta M. Varronem doctissimus, in undecimo commentariorum grammaticorum refert versum ex antiquo carmine memoria hercule dignum: *Religentem esse oportet, religiosum nefas*, Cujus autem id carmen sit, non scribit, atque in eodem loco Nigidius; Hoc, inquit, inclinamentum semper hujusmodi verborum, ut *vinosus*, *mulierosus*, *religiosus*, *nummosus*, signat copiam quandam immodicam rei, super qua dicitur, quocirca *religiosus* is appellabatur, qui nimia et superstitiosa religione sese alligaverat, eaque res vitio assignabatur. According to this it is beyond a doubt that *religens* and *religiosus* do not contain different ideas but one and the same idea, viz.: *religio*, and differ only quantitatively or in degree. So that according to this ancient apothegm, *religio* is to be derived from *religens* (= *relegens*). That *religere* and *relegere* were used indiscriminately is shown, as has been already remarked, by other derivatives of the root-verb, such as *intelligo* and *intellego*, *diligo* and *dilego*, *negligo* and *neglego*, as well as by the unquestionable deri-

vation of the verbs *colligere* and *eligere*, etc., from *legere*. In *religere* therefore the stem-vowel *i* is not original, as it is in *ligare* and *religare* (hence *lictor*. Gell., xii. 3), but originated through the changing of *e* into *i* (hence *lector*.)

An attempt has been made to disprove this derivation from *relegere* (= *religere*) by maintaining that in all substantives derived from compound verbs, the original stem-vowel of the simple verb reappears, as *contagio* from *contingere*, *tangere*, so that we ought to have *relegio* and not *religio*. But this position is shown to be untenable by the following instances: *collisio*, *collidere*, *lædere*; *occisio*, *occidere*, *cædere*; *concisio*, *concidere*, *cædere*; *explosio*, *explodere*, *plaudere*.

2. Even if we did not possess the above important apothegm the question could nevertheless be determined in a most satisfactory way in favor of Cicero's etymology, and that by means of a historical argument. The idea of religion involved in the explanation of Lactantius is utterly foreign to the heathen mind, and throughout their entire literature there cannot be shown an instance in which the word *religio* is used in a sense answering to that idea. On the other hand the conception of religion that comes to view in the etymology and definition given by Cicero, is precisely that of the heathen world and especially that of the Romans; and a corresponding usage of the word *religio* can be proven from their literature beyond a doubt. Nothing was more remote from the sentiments of the Romans, as well as all heathen nations, than the feeling of being joined to the gods or the deity by a *vinculum pietatis*, of standing in any relation whatever of communion with them. On the contrary, they stood over against the divine powers with a feeling of reverence, awe and fear, grounded in the very consciousness of being destitute of all communion with them. As an argument to the contrary, reference has been made (Nitzsch, above-named Art., p. 542), to the German word *ee* (*ehe*) as containing the idea of religion, forgetting that the German literature, in which this word is found, belongs already to the Christian era. Lactantius, like most theologians who followed his explanation, inquired rather what the true and

Christian idea of religion is than how the idea of religion was apprehended by the Romans. The latter and not the former is the important point in the inquiry. The question is not what form the idea of religion assumed *after* the reconciliation of man with God through Christ, but rather what form it had *before*. How unhistorical is Fleck (*System der Dogm.*, I., p. 11), when he characterizes the following explanation of *religio*, given by Sederholm, who follows Lactantius, as "essentially correctly apprehended in point of etymology" (etymologisch im Wesentlichen richtig gefühlt): * "God on His part draws to Himself the finite spirit which on its part strives after Him, and the belief that the spirit of grace obeys the attractive power of God is in itself religion in the usual sense of the word. But when there is a fall and the human spirit has turned away from God and the life in Him, then faith is *religio*, a reuniting of our souls with the divine Being." (Sederholm, *Die ewigen That-sachen*, etc., p. 182-83). We are all the more surprised at this totally groundless commendation of Sederholm's explanation of *religio*, involving as it does, the greatest anachronism, because Fleck himself, although he adopts the etymology of Lactantius, rejects his conception of *religare* and *religio*, and conceives of *religare* as a binding back, a holding fast and restraining from that which inspires awe and does not permit any contact or approach.

On these two conceptions, viz.: that of being bound and restrained and that of fear and awe, turns the question with reference to the historical signification of the word *religio*. It only remains to ascertain which of the two is to be regarded as the primary and original one and accordingly the one that determines the genesis of the word. On this question depends the final decision between the two etymologies. For the fact that Lactantius' conception of *religio* is not wholly adequate to his etymology, and that even in retaining his etymology a different idea of *religare* and *religio* from his own must be as-

* Den seinerseits Gott zustrebenden endlichen Geist zieht aber Gott seinerseits an, und der Glaube, dass der Geist der Gnade der Anziehungskraft Gottes gehorcht, ist an sich Religion im gangbaren Sinne des Wortes.

sumed, results doubtless from this: that Lactantius never made due account of the prefix *re*, and moreover that *religio* never has the sense of a connecting bond, nor is ever, as would be required in this case, construed with *cum* or *ad*.

With respect to the decisive question just stated, we shall now place the facts in contrast with each other. 1. According to a general usage of the Latin language, there was contained in *religio* the idea of awe and fear and of a certain care or solicitude resulting therefrom. In support of this we may cite the following *genera loquendi* from different writers: Cic. de Div., i. 35: Nec eam rem habuit religioni. Id. pro. Cæcin: Alicui religionem injicere. Id. De Nat. Deor., ii. 4: Res illa in religionem populo venit Liv. xxii. 42: religionem incutere animo; xxvi. 11: in religionem ea res apud Pœnos versa est. Virg. Aen viii. 349: religio pavidos terrebat aggresstes dira loci. Horat. Sat., i. 9, 70: Vis tu curtis Judæis oppedere? nulla mihi, inquam, religio est, Plin. v. 1: Subit tacita religio animæ. Varro apud non. c. iv. n. 387: Non demunt animis curas ac religiones Persarum montes, non atria diviti' Crassi.

2. *Religio* also contains the idea of a being bound. Lucret., i. 930: arctis religionem nodis ex solvere pergo,—the passage to which Lactantius refers (iv. 28.) Livy, ii. 32: Et primo agitatam dicitur de consulum cæde, ut solverentur sacramento, doctos, deinde, nullam scelere religionem exsolvi, in sacrum montem secessisse; ix. 8: Exsolvamus religione populum, si qua obligavimus, ne quid divini humanive obstet, quominus minus justum piumque de integro ineatur bellum; v. 23; Laudem eo decursum, est ut, qui se domumque religione exsolvere vellet, etc.

That, however, of these two ideas that of fear and awe is the original one and not that of a being bound, but that the latter rather originated from the idea of fear and awe on account of the divine powers, is shown by the above words of Nigidius Figulus: quocirca religiosus is appellabatur, qui nimia et superstitiosa religione se alligaverat. It is also proven by a passage in Terence Andr. v. 4, 38, where Chremes says: At mi unus scru-

pulus etiam restat, qui me male habet; whereupon Pamphilus answers: Dignus es cum tua *religione* odio; *nodum* in scirpo *quaeris*: also by Cicero Cat., iii. 6: Ut quæ religio C. Mario non fuerat, quominus C. Glauciam occideret, ea nos religione in Lentulo puniendo liberaremur. For in all other passages *religio* clearly signifies a timidity of conscience, a scrupulousness that at first results in a hesitation, a restraint from resolving to action. It is further proven from a passage in Livy vii. 3, where the verb *levare* stands for *exsolvere*, and the *religio* of the soul is compared to the sickness of the body: nec tamen ludorum primum initium procurandis religionibus datum aut religione animos aut corpora morbis levavit. To conclude from the expression *religione exsolvere aliquem* that *religio* contained etymologically the idea of binding, (Hahn Lehrbuch des Chr. Gl. 2d ed. I. p. 3) was utterly unwarranted,—as much so as if from the above expression *religione levare aliquem* we should infer that *religio* etymologically contained the idea of a *burden*, or from the above quoted words of Livy *ut solverentur sacramento*, to conclude that *sacramento* etymologically contained the idea of *binding*. Thus the most important argument that has been advanced in favor of the etymology of Lactantius is refuted. We shall now turn to the positive discussion of the etymology and significance of *religio*.

Legere, corresponding perhaps in its original meaning, as also J. G. Miller thinks, to the German word *legen*, denotes; 1. To lay together piece by piece, to gather or collect, e. g. *nuces*, *flores*, also *vela funem legere*. 2. To gather together or collect, as it were, an expanse by means of steps, to go over or traverse, e. g. *viam*, *vestigia*, *æquor legere*—German Zurücklegen. 3. To collect something with the eyes or ears in its separate, single parts; hence, to examine, to listen to attentively; especially to collect the elements of speech—words; hence, to read. *Relegere* denotes therefore; 1, to collect again; 2, to go over or traverse again, and indeed literally as well as figuratively, i. e. in language (e. g. *suos labores sermone religere*) as well as in thought in the way of reflection or meditation; 3, to read again. By way of showing that Seidenroth's arguments are

invalid, we may here remark that *intellego* accordingly signifies : to collect the distinguishing characteristics of a thing, and thereby to know and understand it ; *negligere* (= *nec-legere*) not to collect, take up or select a thing ; finally, *diligere* (= *dislegere*) to collect something by separating it from others ; to take up, select, and therefore value, esteem and love it. (Concerning *diligens* as a derivative from *legere*, see Varro, ed. Bip. p. 69.)

The question is now whether in the above classic passage of Cicero, qui omnia, quæ ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tamquam relegerent, *relegere* has the second or third of the meanings given above,—whether it denotes to traverse repeatedly in thought, to reflect and ponder over, or to read over repeatedly, as Nitzsch (in the above-mentioned Art., p. 569) takes it. In the latter case, it would have to be referred to written ordinances respecting their worship. We must give our decided preference to the former : 1. Because otherwise, instead of the more general expression *pertinerent*, we should expect the more definite one, *scripta essent* ; 2, because *tamquam* would otherwise be inappropriate, since the usual meaning of *relegere* is to read again ; 3, since among the Romans the directions and regulations respecting their worship (*cultus*) were not written down as precisely and fully as among the Jews, but were handed down from one generation to another by custom ; 4, and finally, and this is the main point, because the sense of a reading again does not suit the sentence quoted above handed down to us by Nigidius Figulus (*Religentem esse oportet, religiosum nefas*) whilst the idea of reflection, pondering over, gives it a clear meaning, viz. : It is proper to be thoughtful (*nach denkend*) respecting divine things, but to be over-scrupulous (*skrupulös*) is wrong.

Religio accordingly is :

1). An earnest consideration of a thing resting on fear and awe, and a conscientious regard for it. In this sense Cicero speaks of a *religio officii*, testimoniorum, religio in consilio dando, religio iudicis. Pro Sulla 3: Sin est in me ratio reipublicæ, religio privati officii, etc. Verr. v. 1: Qui sibi hoc sumit, ut corrigat mores aliorum, quis huic ignoscat, si

qua in re ipse ab religione officii declinarit. Pro. Flacc. iv.: Testimoniorum religionem et fidem nunquam ista natio coluit. 2). In general awe, fear, scrupulousness; hence the general *loquendi*: rem religioni habere, in religionem aliquid trahere, religionem alicui injicere. 3). Particularly the awe, fear, and scrupulousness of a superstitious character in divine things, as is especially shown by the above explanation of *religiosus*, given by Nigidius Figulus, as quoted in Gell. iv. 9. Accordingly those things were called *religiones* which awakened this superstitious fear. Hence the explanation of *religio* given by Ernesti Clav. Cic.: *religiones dicuntur de auspiciis, prodigiis, etc., quæ dubitationem agendi afferunt aut impediunt aliquid.* Hence those days of which nothing good was expected were characterized as *dies religiosi* (see Gell. Noct. Att. iv. 9.) On the other hand, on account of this general meaning of the word those customs were also called *religiones*, by means of which an effort was made to silence this superstitious fear on account of things of this kind. Cicero, Pro. Domo xl.: Ut non putares does satis posse placari, nisi etiam muliebribus religionibus te implicuisses, etc. 4). The reverence for things truly divine and sacred, which, in a state of higher culture and as a result of a superstitious fear, still remained in the feeling of dependence on the divine power, and which, just because it belongs to a higher stage of culture, cannot be identified with the meaning given under 3) and be regarded as equally original with it. This conception of *religio* is the one that is found in Cicero in the classic passage, De Nat. Deo, ii. 28 and ii. 42, (*religio deorum cultu pio continetur*), and is the one that forms the foundation of the Christian conception of religion. Gellius brings out this idea when he refers to the fact that the temples were called *delubra religiosa* as *majestatis venerationibusque plena*. *Religio* in this highest stage is essentially identical in meaning with *pietas*, and is therefore used by Cicero in the passages already quoted (De Invent. ii. 22, and De Leg. ii. 11) as synonymous with it. That in common usage this idea of *religio* could not always be distinguished, with respect to the object, from a superstitious fear, and that, in consequence of

this, also customs in religious worship were designated as *religiones*, lay in the very nature of the case. Thus it is said, Cic. Pro. Font. ix. 9: *Ceteræ nationes pro religionibus suis bella suscipiunt, ista contra omnium religiones.* That idea of *religio*, on the other hand, which Augustine (De Civ. Dei, x. 4), advances on the basis of the Ciceronian etymology, in that he finds in the word the notion of a re-election of God, who had been lost through sin, is manifestly as impossible philologically as it is historically, since it rests on a confounding of the Christian religious consciousness with that of the heathen.

It is evident from our inquiry that *religio* involves an idea of such nature and of such generality that it must have appeared an appropriate designation of the religious sentiments and the religious life of all nations, whether they stood on a higher or lower plane of this life. What man is sensible of by nature over against the Deity, and how he is by nature related to it, precisely this it is that is found etymologically and historically in the word *religio*. It is the feeling of dependence on the mysterious divine power and the feeling of fear and awe resulting therefrom, together with a corresponding behavior or mode of acting. The word therefore answers exactly the pre-Christian religiousness. The Greeks designated the very same idea by such terms as *δαιοδαιμονία*, *σέβας*, *θεοσέβεια*, *τὸ θεοσεβές*, *ἐβσέβεια* *τὸ ἐβσεβές*; the Jews by *יִרְאָה*, *יִרְאָה*. But the Christian religiousness also is not without the ground features of these natural feelings over against God; and when we desire to return back to these natural feelings, we prefer still to speak only in general of religion and religiousness, instead of Christianity and faith.

The transition of the word into the general usage of the language as a designation of the natural and therefore more legal divine service, may have been brought about historically by the fact that the term *θρησκεία* in Acts xxvi. 5, and James i. 27, denoting the legal worship, is translated by *religio* in the Vulgate. This conjecture, at all events, is made probable by the words of Augustine quoted above, (De Civ. Dei, x. 1): *isto nomine interpretati sunt nostri eam, quæ græce θρησκεία dicitur.*

126
Vol. I.

Rev. Prof. Dr. H. S. Galt
NEW SERIES.

No. 1.

THE
Reformed Quarterly Review.

EDITOR:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

The Truth shall make you Free.

VOLUME XXVI.

JANUARY, 1879.


PHILADELPHIA:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 ARCH STREET.

CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE,	PAGE.
I. INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE,	5
II. THE BREAD OF LIFE. A Communion Sermon. By J. Wil- liamson Nevin, D.D.,	14
III. JAPAN AND THE OUTSIDE WORLD,	48
IV. A PLEA FOR THE STUDY OF LANGUAGES—ANCIENT AND MODERN—AND OF THEIR LITERATURE BY THE MEDICAL STUDENT. By Lewis H. Steiner, A. M., M.D., Frederick City, Md.,	77
V. TOLERATION AS A MODERN GROWTH. By I. E. Graeff, Tamaqua, Pa.,	86
VI. THE PRACTICAL ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY. By Conrad Clever, A. B.	102
VII. WHAT IS EDUCATION? By Rev. A. B. Koplin, A.M.	126
VIII. HISTORY OF THE OHIO SYNOD. By I. H. Reiter, D.D.,	143
IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	169

 **THE BEST LITERATURE OF THE DAY.**—*N. Y. Times*



THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

PROF. MAX MÜLLER,
RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE,
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
PROF. HUXLEY,
RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
PROF. GOLDWIN SMITH,
EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
PROF. TYNDALL,
DR. W. B. CARPENTER,
FRANCES POWER COBBE,
THE DUKE OF ARGYLL,

WILLIAM BLACK,
MISS THACHERAY,
MRS. MULOCH CRAIK,
GEORGE MACDONALD,
MRS. OLIPHANT,
MRS. ALEXANDER,
JEAN INGELOW,
JULIA KAVANAGH,
THOMAS HARDY,
MATTHEW ARNOLD,
J. NORMAN LOCKYER,

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.
ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
HENRY KINGSLEY,
W. W. STORY,
IVAN TURGUENIEF,
RUSKIN,

TENNYSON,
BROWNING,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

In 1879, THE LIVING AGE enters upon its *thirty sixth* year, admittedly unrivalled and continuously successful. During the year it will furnish to its readers the productions of the most eminent authors, **above named and many others**; embracing the choicest Serial and Short Stories by the **Leading Foreign Novelists**, and an amount

UNAPPROACHED BY ANY OTHER PERIODICAL.

in the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day, from the pens of the **foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors**, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

THE LIVING AGE is a *weekly magazine* giving more than

Three and a Quarter Thousand

double-column octavo pages of reading matter yearly. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a **satisfactory completeness** attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and discovery. Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature, and from the pens of the

ABLEST LIVING WRITERS.

"It reproduces the best thoughts of the best minds of the civilized world, upon all topics of living interest."—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

"The prince among magazines."—*New York Observer*.

"It affords the best, the cheapest and most convenient means of keeping abreast with the progress of thought in all its phases."—*Philadelphia North American*.

"A pure and perpetual reservoir and fountain of entertainment and instruction."—*Hon. Robert C. Winthrop*.

"The choicest literature of the day."—*New York Tribune*.

"The best periodical in America."—*Theo. L. Cuyler, D.D.*

"And the cheapest. A monthly that comes EVERY WEEK."—*The Advance, Chicago*.

"With it ALONE a reader may fairly keep up with all that is important in the literature, history, politics, and science of the day."—*The Methodist, New York*.

"The ablest essays, the most entertaining stories, the finest poetry of the English language, are here gathered together."—*Illinois State Journal*.

"It has no equal in any country."—*Philadelphia Press*.

"It is INDISPENSABLE TO EVERY ONE who desires a thorough compendium of all that is admirable and noteworthy in the literary world."—*Boston Post*.

"Ought to find a place in every American home."—*New York Times*.

THE LIVING AGE is published weekly at \$8.00 a year, *free of postage*. Now is the time to subscribe, beginning with the *New Year*.

Club Prices for the Best Home and Foreign Literature.

"Possessed of THE LIVING AGE and one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in *command of the whole situation*."—*Philada. Evening Bulletin*.

For \$10.50 THE LIVING AGE and *either one* of the American \$4 Monthlies (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Bazaar*) will be sent for a year, *both postpaid*; or, for \$9.50 THE LIVING AGE and the *St. Nicholas* or *Appleton's Journal*.

EXTRA OFFER FOR 1879.

To all new subscribers for 1879, will be sent *gratis* the six numbers of 1878, containing with other valuable matter, the first parts of "SIR GIBBIE," a new and powerful serial story by GEORGE MACDONALD, now appearing in THE LIVING AGE from the author's advance sheets.

Address—

LITTELL & GAY, Boston.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and theological institutions, while great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most irrefractory confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D. D., assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS:

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
307 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

Recd prof F A Gast

VOL. I.

NEW SERIES.

No. 2.

THE
Reformed Quarterly Review.

EDITOR:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

The Truth shall make you Free.

VOLUME XXVI.

APRIL, 1879.

PHILADELPHIA:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 ARCH STREET.

CONTENTS OF APRIL NUMBER.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I. DESPOTIC RUSSIA. By Prof. Charles Rudey, Paris, France,	174
II. PREACH THE WORD. By Rev. J. H. Apple,	203
III. SCHOOL LIFE IN ANCIENT ATHENS. By Rev. N. C. Schaeffer,	217
IV. THE LORD'S PRAYER. By Rev. S. N. Callender, D.D.,	231
V. THE IMPECCABILITY OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST. By Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D.,	258
VI. THE BOOK OF JOB. By Rev. R. Leighton Gerhart,	277
VII. THE DANGER OF THE REPUBLIC FROM ATHEISM, COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM. By Rev. James Crawford,	302
VIII. REVIEW OF ARTICLE II IN JANUARY QUARTERLY. By Rev. Prof. Eph. M. Epstein, M. D.,	317
IX. NITZSCH'S PROTESTANT THESES. By Rev. Theodore Appel, D.D.	336
CORRECTIONS,	352

'THE BEST LITERATURE OF THE DAY.'—*N. Y. Times*



FRANCIS W. NEWMAN,
ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
HENRY KINGSLEY,

THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

PROF. MAX MULLER,
RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE,
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
PROF. HUXLEY,
RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
PROF. GOLDWIN SMITH,
EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
PROF. TYNDALL,
DR. W. B. CARPENTER,
FRANCES POWER COBBE,
THE DUKE OF ARGYLL,
W. W. STORY,
IVAN TURGUENIEF,
RUSKIN,

WILLIAM BLACK,
MISS THACHERAY,
MRS. MULOCH CRAIK,
GEORGE MACDONALD,
MRS. OLIPHANT,
MRS. ALEXANDER,
JEAN INGELow,
JULIA KAVANAGH,
THOMAS HARDY,
MATTHEW ARNOLD,
J. NORMAN LOCKYER,
TENNYSON,
BROWNING,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

In 1879, THE LIVING AGE enters upon its *thirty-sixth* year, admittedly unrivalled and continuously successful. During the year it will furnish to its readers the productions of the most eminent authors, **above named and many others**; embracing the choicest Serial and Short Stories by the **Leading Foreign Novelists**, and an amount

UNAPPROACHED BY ANY OTHER PERIODICAL.

In the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day, from the pens of the **foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors**, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

THE LIVING AGE is a *weekly* magazine giving more than **Three and a Quarter Thousand** double-column octavo pages of reading matter yearly. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a **satisfactory completeness** attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and discovery, Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature, and from the pens of the

ABLEST LIVING WRITERS.

"It reproduces the best thoughts of the best minds of the civilized world, upon all topics of living interest."—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

"The prince among magazines."—*New York Observer*.

"It affords the best, the cheapest and most convenient means of keeping abreast with the progress of thought in all its phases."—*Philadelphia North American*.

"A pure and perpetual reservoir and fountain of entertainment and instruction."—*Hon. Robert C. Winthrop*.

"The choicest literature of the day."—*New York Tribune*.

"The best periodical in America."—*Theo. L. Cuyler, D.D.*

"And the cheapest. A monthly that comes **EVERY WEEK**."—*The Advance, Chicago*.

"With it **ALONE** a reader may fairly keep up with all that is important in the literature, history, politics, and science of the day."—*The Methodist, New York*.

"The ablest essays, the most entertaining stories, the finest poetry of the English language, are here gathered together."—*Illinois State Journal*.

"It has no equal in any country."—*Philadelphia Press*.

"It is **INDISPENSABLE** TO EVERY ONE who desires a thorough compendium of all that is admirable and noteworthy in the literary world."—*Boston Post*.

"Ought to find a place in every American home."—*New York Times*.

THE LIVING AGE is published weekly at \$8.00 a year, *free of postage*. Now is the time to subscribe, beginning with the *New Year*.

Club Prices for the Best Home and Foreign Literature.

"Possessed of THE LIVING AGE and one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in command of the whole situation."—*Philada. Evening Bulletin*.

For \$10.50 THE LIVING AGE and either one of the American \$4 Monthlies (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Bazaar*) will be sent for a year, *both postpaid*; or, for \$9.50 THE LIVING AGE and the *St. Nicholas* or *Appleton's Journal*.

EXTRA OFFER FOR 1879.

To all new subscribers for 1879, will be sent *gratis* the six numbers of 1878, containing with other valuable matter, the first parts of "SIR GIBBIE," a new and powerful serial story by GEORGE MACDONALD, now appearing in THE LIVING AGE from the author's advance sheets.

LITTELL & GAY, Boston.

Address

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and theological institutions, while great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most irenical confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning, as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D. D., assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS:

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to publishers.

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

Rev. Prof. D. W. East.

VOL. I.

NEW SERIES.

No. 3.

THE
Reformed Quarterly Review.

EDITOR:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

The Truth shall make you Free.


VOLUME XXVI.

JULY, 1879.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 ARCH STREET.

CONTENTS OF JULY NUMBER.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I. OBSERVATIONS ON RUSSIA. By H. P. Laird, Esq.	353
II. IS HUMAN NATURE RELIGIOUS? By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D.	377
III. OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT OF MAN. By Prof. F. A. Gast, D. D.	391
IV. ERWECKLICHE PREDIGT. By H. G. Rutenik, D. D.	413
V. THE WARFARE OF LIFE. By the Editor.	422
VI. A REVIEW OF AN ARTICLE ON THE NUMBERS OF GENESIS. By J. E. Kirschner, A. B.	434
VII. THE TEUTON IN CIVILIZATION. By Jer. S. Hess.	444
VIII. THE KINGDOM OF GOD. By a Presbyter of the Diocese of Ohio.	458
IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	480

 **THE BEST LITERATURE OF THE DAY.**—*N. Y. Times*



THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

PROF. MAX MULLER,
RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE,
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
PROF. HUXLEY,
RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
PROF. GOLDWIN SMITH,
EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
PROF. TYNDALL,
DR. W. B. CARPENTER,
FRANCES POWER COBBE,
THE DUKE OF ARGYLL,

WILLIAM BLACK,
MISS THACHERAY,
MRS. MULOCH CRAIK,
GEORGE MACDONALD,
MRS. OLIPHANT,
MRS. ALEXANDER,
JEAN INGELow,
JULIA KAVANAGH,
THOMAS HARDY,
MATTHEW ARNOLD,
J. NORMAN LOCKYER,
TENNYSON,
BROWNING,

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.
ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
HENRY KINGSLEY,

W. W. STORY,
IVAN TURGUENIEF,
RUSKIN,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

In 1879, THE LIVING AGE enters upon its *thirty sixth* year, admittedly unrivalled and continuously successful. During the year it will furnish to its readers the productions of the most eminent authors, **above named and many others**; embracing the choicest Serial and Short Stories by the **Leading Foreign Novelists**, and an amount

UNAPPROACHED BY ANY OTHER PERIODICAL

in the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day, from the pens of the **foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors**, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

THE LIVING AGE is a *weekly* magazine giving more than

Three and a Quarter Thousand

double-column octavo pages of reading matter yearly. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a **satisfactory completeness** attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and discovery. Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature, and from the pens of the

ABLEST LIVING WRITERS.

"It reproduces the best thoughts of the best minds of the civilized world, upon all topics of living interest."—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

"The prince among magazines."—*New York Observer*.

"It affords the best, the cheapest and most convenient means of keeping abreast with the progress of thought in all its phases."—*Philadelphia North American*.

"A pure and perpetual reservoir and fountain of entertainment and instruction."—*Hon. Robert C. Winthrop*.

"The choicest literature of the day."—*New York Tribune*.

"The best periodical in America."—*Theo. L. Cuyler, D.D.*

"And the cheapest. A monthly that comes EVERY WEEK."—*The Advance, Chicago*.

"With it ALONE a reader may fairly keep up with all that is important in the literature, history, politics, and science of the day."—*The Methodist, New York*.

"The ablest essays, the most entertaining stories, the finest poetry of the English language, are here gathered together."—*Illinois State Journal*.

"It has no equal in any country."—*Philadelphia Press*.

"It is INDISPENSABLE to EVERY ONE who desires a thorough compendium of all that is admirable and noteworthy in the literary world."—*Boston Post*.

"Ought to find a place in every American home."—*New York Times*.

THE LIVING AGE is published weekly at \$3.00 a year, *free of postage*. Now is the time to subscribe, beginning with the *New Year*.

Club Prices for the Best Home and Foreign Literature.

"Possessed of THE LIVING AGE and one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in *command of the whole situation*."—*Phila. Evening Bulletin*.

For \$10.50 THE LIVING AGE and either one of the American \$4 Monthlies (or *Harper's Weekly or Bazaar*) will be sent for a year, *both postpaid*; or, for \$9.50 THE LIVING AGE and the *S. Nicholas or Appleton's Journal*.

EXTRA OFFER FOR 1879.

To all new subscribers for 1879, will be sent *gratis* the six numbers of 1878, containing with other valuable matter, the first parts of "SIR GIBBIE," a new and powerful serial story by **GEORGE MACDONALD**, now appearing in THE LIVING AGE from the author's advance sheets.

Address

LITTELL & GAY, Boston.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and theological institutions, while great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most irenical confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D. D., assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS:

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

Vol. I.

NEW SERIES.

No. 4.

THE
Reformed Quarterly Review.

EDITOR:

THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

The Truth shall make you Free.

VOLUME XXVI.

OCTOBER, 1879.

PHILADELPHIA:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 ARCH STREET.

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER NUMBER.

I. THE SELF-INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE. By the Editor	485
II. THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMAN. By Rev. W. A. Hale	502
III. THE CHURCH OF CHRIST WITH REFERENCE TO SPECIAL PERIODS IN HER DEVELOPMENT. By Rev. J. W. Santee, D.D., Cavetown, Md.	513
IV. COLLEGE COMMENCEMENTS. By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A.M.	537
V. ORATORY IN PREACHING. By Rev. Phaon S. Kohler.	552
VI. THE PLENARY INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. By Rev. A. H. Kremer, D.D.	562
VII. SPIRITUAL DYNAMICS. By Rev. Allen Traver, Rochester, N. Y.	572
VIII. THE REFORMED CHURCH AND POLITICAL LIBER- TY. By Prof. H. W. Super, D.D.	604
IX. ETYMOLOGY AND PRIMITIVE SIGNIFICATION OF THE WORD RELIGIO. Translated by Thomas M. Balliett	625

➔ "THE BEST LITERATURE OF THE DAY."—*N. Y. Times*



THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORS, such as

PROF. MAX MULLER,
RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE,
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE,
PROF. HUXLEY,
RICHARD A. PROCTOR,
PROF. GOLDWIN SMITH,
EDWARD A. FREEMAN,
PROF. TYNDALL,
DR. W. B. CARPENTER,
FRANCES POWER COBBE,
THE DUKE OF ARGYLL,

WILLIAM BLACK,
MISS THACHERAY,
MRS. MULOCH CRAIK,
GEORGE MACDONALD,
MRS. OLIPHANT,
MRS. ALEXANDER,
JEAN INGELow,
JULIA KAVANAGH,
THOMAS HARDY,
MATTHEW ARNOLD,
J. NORMAN LOCKYER,
TENNYSON,
BROWNING,

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.
ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE,
HENRY KINGSLEY,
W. W. STORY,
IVAN TURGUENIEFF,
RUSKIN,

and many others, are represented in the pages of

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

In 1879, THE LIVING AGE enters upon its *thirty sixth* year, admittedly unrivalled and continuously successful. During the year it will furnish to its readers the productions of the most eminent authors, **above named and many others**; embracing the choicest Serial and Short Stories by the **Leading Foreign Novelists**, and an amount

UNAPPROACHED BY ANY OTHER PERIODICAL.

in the world, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day, from the pens of the **foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors**, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

THE LIVING AGE is a *weekly* magazine giving more than

Three and a Quarter Thousand

double-column octavo pages of reading matter yearly. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a **satisfactory completeness** attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and discovery. Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature, and from the pens of the

ABLEST LIVING WRITERS.

"It reproduces the best thoughts of the best minds of the civilized world, upon all topics of living interest."—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

"The prince among magazines."—*New York Observer*.

"It affords the best, the cheapest and most convenient means of keeping abreast with the progress of thought in all its phases."—*Philadelphia North American*.

"A pure and perpetual reservoir and fountain of entertainment and instruction."—*Hon. Robert C. Winthrop*.

"The choicest literature of the day."—*New York Tribune*.

"The best periodical in America."—*Theo. L. Cuyler, D.D.*

"And the cheapest. A monthly that comes EVERY WEEK."—*The Advance, Chicago*.

"With it ALONE a reader may fairly keep up with all that is important in the literature, history, politics, and science of the day."—*The Methodist, New York*.

"The ablest essays, the most entertaining stories, the finest poetry of the English language, are here gathered together."—*Illinois State Journal*.

"It has no equal in any country."—*Philadelphia Press*.

"It is INDISPENSABLE to EVERY ONE who desires a thorough compendium of all that is admirable and noteworthy in the literary world."—*Boston Post*.

"Ought to find a place in every American home."—*New York Times*.

THE LIVING AGE is published weekly at \$8.00 a year, *free of postage*. Now is the time to subscribe, beginning with the *New Year*.

Club Prices for the Best Home and Foreign Literature.

"Possessed of THE LIVING AGE and one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in *command of the whole situation*."—*Philada. Evening Bulletin*.

For \$10.50 THE LIVING AGE and *either one* of the American \$4 Monthlies (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Bazaar*) will be sent for a year, *both postpaid*; or, for \$9.50 THE LIVING AGE and the *St. Nicholas* or *Appleton's Journal*.

➔ EXTRA OFFER FOR 1879. ➔

To all new subscribers for 1879, will be sent *gratis* the six numbers of 1878, containing with other valuable matter, the first parts of "SIR GIBBIE," a new and powerful serial story by **GEORGE MACDONALD**, now appearing in THE LIVING AGE from the author's advance sheets.

Address

LITTELL & GAY, Boston.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The MERCERSBURG REVIEW was commenced in January, 1849, and it has been published regularly ever since, except during the years 1861-1867, when its publication was suspended chiefly on account of the civil war then existing in the country. During the past thirty years it has supported the system of philosophy and theology taught in the institutions of the Reformed Church, located for a time at Mercersburg, and afterwards at Lancaster, Pa., while it has labored also in the general interest of science and literature, in common with the theological quarterlies of this and other countries. It became thus more or less identified with a school of philosophy and theology in the Reformed Church, known as the Mercersburg school. During this period of over a quarter of a century, the Reformed Church has grown into larger proportion and established other literary and theological institutions, while great progress has been made also in the theological life of Christianity and the Church throughout the world.

In dropping its old name and adopting a new one, it aims to advance with this progress and widen its sphere of usefulness. As the only theological quarterly published in the Reformed Church in this country, it will seek to be an organ for the whole Church. So far as it is a denominational organ, therefore, it will stand on the doctrinal basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, the most ironical confession of the Reformed Churches of the Reformation, and the only confession of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it invites to its pages articles of approved literary ability from all in that Church who hold to that confession, whatever may be their minor differences in theological views.

But while it holds this denominational relationship and character, it will continue to labor in a broad catholic spirit for the interests of scientific and theological learning as these are related to the progress of Christianity in general. Taking for its motto the words of our Lord, "The truth shall make you free," it will be in sympathy with freedom of inquiry and the spirit of Divine charity, as necessary conditions for harmonizing all antagonisms. It is believed that while denominational boundaries may still be necessary in the Church, yet in the higher departments of theological inquiry, these lines of separation should be least visible. The QUARTERLY REVIEW will, therefore, be in harmony with the spirit of union which is asserting itself with growing power in the Christian Church throughout the world. While it continues to be a theological Review, it will welcome articles also of a general scientific and literary character, believing that science and religion, when true to themselves, must tend freely towards harmonious agreement and union.

The REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW is edited by Thos. G. Apple, D. D., assisted by eminent writers in the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly, in the months of January, April, July and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers, accompanied with \$18.

Orders, with remittances per check or money order, are to be sent direct to publishers.

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

507 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

Bucks

